

The Review of English Studies

VOL. VIII.—No. 29.

JANUARY 1932.

RACEDOWN AND THE WORDSWORTHS

By BERGEN EVANS and HESTER PINNEY

[This paper does not pretend to present a full picture of Wordsworth's sojourn at Racedown; it only hopes to be able to add a little new information to what is already known, being more of a supplement to the several excellent accounts already in print than a complete work in itself. The materials are drawn almost entirely from letters and other papers recently examined at The Grange, Somerton, Somerset, and for the use of which we are indebted to the kindness of Mr. and Mrs. Pretor-Pinney.]

THE Pinneys were of Dorset and Somerset stock. As early as 1406 we find Pinney Wood in the Axminster Hundred being granted to one John Pinney, to be held as his father had held it before him. In 1542, when Henry VIII asked for a list of those liable to bear arms, he was told that John Pinney of Chardstrek "hath a bowe & half a sheafe of arrowes." Calamy tells us that when Thomas Fuller returned to his vicarage of Broadwindsor after the Restoration he found another John Pinney in his pulpit, and after hearing him preach declared that he would never deprive the congregation of so excellent a man, made over the vicarage to him in its entirety, and went his ways.¹ In 1672 Charles II made a special grant under the Privy Seal to John Pinney "of the perswasion commonly called Presbyterien," permitting him to have a meeting place for worship in his house at Bettiscombe.²

The principles of this John Pinney were apparently shared by his son Azariah, whose nonconformist zeal led him to join Mon-

¹ *The Nonconformists Memorial*, 2nd ed. of Palmer's Correction, 3 vols., 8vo, 1802. Vol. ii, p. 119.

² This grant is now at Racedown.

mouth's ill-fated rebellion. A cousin of the same name was hanged for his share in the uprising, but Azariah the son of John escaped with a sentence of transportation, and was saved from the worst hardships by the judicious expenditure, in the right places, of £65 by his brother Nathaniel.¹ For this sum he was freed from compulsory service and permitted to choose his destination in the West Indies. He settled in Nevis, became a planter, and prospered. His son became chief justice of the island, and *his* son, John Frederick Pinney, acquired sufficient wealth to be able to retire. He returned to Dorset and with his father's cousin, Azariah, a widower, took up his residence in the old manor house of Bettiscombe. Shortly after his return he was elected M.P. for Bridport, and the two old gentlemen lived in dignity and state with six fine horses to their coach to drag them up the steep and muddy hills of Dorset. They seem to have left the nonconformist fold, for they quarrelled with their bishop so bitterly, over the removal of a curate from their parish, which they demanded and the bishop refused, that they would not leave even their bones in the parish church, but at their expressed wish were buried in Wayford Church some four miles away. Their wealth and imperious tempers made them the objects of gossip and probably of some fear to the peasantry. Strange stories grew up about them. It was an accepted belief that the skull which they kept in the house, and which was said to be that of a negro, had been heard to scream in the nights. There could be no good in such things.²

But whatever cloud or mystery might hang over the two old men at Bettiscombe, there could be no question of the sterling and conventional character of their young cousin, John Pretor, whom they took under their patronage (partly as a protest against his mother's second marriage, of which they disapproved), and to whom they left their estates. To receive the bequest of his cousins he assumed their surname, dropping his own and being subsequently known as John Pinney. He was assiduous and unctuous in his attentions to them, and early showed his sound judgment by the dexterity with which he extricated himself from the danger of marrying a young lady of Dorchester whose attractions were blemished by an insufficient dower. In 1764, the year in which he succeeded to

¹ This Nathaniel married a Miss Gay of Barnstaple, a first cousin to the poet, whose family kept a milliner's shop in London and did extensive trading with the Indies as early as 1680. Many of their papers are among the Pinney Papers.

² For some account of "The Screaming Skull of Bettiscombe," see *Proceedings of the Dorset Antiquarian Field Club*, vol. xxxi, p. 176, 1910.

his estates, he was elected High Sheriff of Dorset, no small honour for a young man of twenty-four, and most likely a sincere pleasure to one who within the last few years had been dancing attendance upon two irascible old cousins.

John Pinney, however, was not the man to mistake the shadow of prosperity for its substance; he stayed but a short while to enjoy this first blaze of glory, and then sailed to the West Indies, where he spent many arduous years in improving his plantations. In 1772 he married Jane Weekes on the Island of Nevis, and in the seventeen-eighties he returned to Bristol and took his place as one of the most prosperous merchants of that prosperous town. He began at once to build a fine town house in Great George Street, Bristol, and for a country house to rebuild Pilsmarsh, or Pylemarsh, Lodge on the side of Pilsdon, the big hill above Bettiscombe which had belonged to his cousins. This latter he intended partly for a summer residence and partly, as he expressed it, for "a lee-port in a storm."

This was no mere whimsical phrase, for the good merchant was a cautious man. In his town house he had built a speaking-tube arrangement, leading from the head of his bed to an opening by the grand staircase, so that he might in comfort and security frighten away any marauders that might break in at night. Later, during the Napoleonic wars, he kept a sum of gold (known only to himself and his youngest son) conveniently hidden in a window seat on the ground floor to provide for a hasty departure in the event of the landing of the French.

He was a neat and methodical man. His accounts are meticulous—and enormously bulky. Not a penny could be spent without the expenditure of almost an equal value of ink and paper to record it. He kept detailed accounts of the sums spent on his various children, literally from the day of their birth. At the birth of his youngest son, Charles, in 1793, eight years after the arrival of his predecessor, the good merchant sat down in all solemnity to record the hour and the minute of "this unexpected event" in his great ledger. Then, in a fine round hand, on a fine clean page, he noted the young man's initial expenses:

26 yards of irish Diaper Linen	£2. 1. —.
$\frac{1}{2}$ lb. of pins	9.
A pap dish and cover	1. —
6d worth of biscuits & a new bottom for the nurse's chair	1. 6.

Yet, though exacting, John Pinney was a generous and sympathetic father. He had high aspirations for his sons. No business worry was too great to prevent him from taking the minutest interest in their education. Their bad spelling and their poor handwriting distressed him. In a letter to the tutor of one of them, he urges him to compel the boy "to copy papers from the *Spectator* in a fair running hand," and adds, "It would be beneficial to him in many respects." Azariah, the second son, seems to have been his favourite. He was to become a merchant, and although his chief studies were mercantile, his father was not averse to his learning "anything else that may be useful to him as a gentleman or scholar," provided it did not interrupt "his more material and beneficial studies."¹

After being under various tutors at home Azariah was sent to a school at Frankfort-am-Main, celebrated for its commercial training. In the year 1789, when the son was but fifteen years old, the ambitious father allowed him to take *his* place in the partnership of Pinney and Tobin, though he discreetly continued to control the business himself and to correct the young merchant's spelling as of old.

On Azariah's return from Germany he was coached by Francis Wrangham, and spent a year at Christ's College, Cambridge. He also came to know Basil Montagu, the illegitimate son of the Earl of Sandwich, and some arrangement was made whereby Montagu was to be his tutor. Montagu engaged to write educational letters to his pupil once a month, but he soon found this agreement too much for his powers and begged to be excused from it.

His tone in the earlier days of the correspondence is one of priggish condescension. "You will remember, Aza," he says in an undated epistle, "that I am now writing as a friend, not as an author." His Godwinian attitude towards truth is somewhat surprising in a tutor. "I am not stating my fixed opinion," he writes, after a world of twaddle on morals,

but sentiments floating in a mind which is in a continued state of oscillation. I believe them to be true when I send them to you ; I may know them to be false to-morrow.

He continues patronisingly :

You, Aza, are to pass your life in the Mercantile world—you have very benevolent dispositions ; you have a good understanding, you may

¹ These quotations are from John Pinney's letters. All quotations in this paper for which no source is given in a note are from letters or papers in the Pinney collection.

produce blessings to thousands. Be acquainted with the laws of your country; and the general principles of law & morality. Be acquainted with geography & the general ["and minute" is here added above the line as a wise afterthought] principles of commerce. History and works of Imagination will be recreation to you, and will purify your mind from the pollution of the Counting House.

"Do not, old Debitor and Creditor," he adds in facetious parentheses, "be thinking of your bills of exchange," and concludes with the lofty observation, "It is our duty . . . to assist in the progress of wisdom."

But the passage of a few years ended the tone of condescension. Montagu was in financial straits and his letters to the wealthy merchants assume a more submissive tone. In 1798 he wrote to John Frederick Pinney, the eldest son, telling him of his needs and troubles:

My first duty is to secure to myself the means of subsistence & of paying Wordsworth. . . .

If I cannot do this unless by a move that will destroy my mind, I shall apply to my friends.—Were I in affluence I should love a man who would make such an application to me. . . . The plan which I should like best would be . . . to lecture you or you and Aza for 2 hours a day & regularly to attend the Sessions. I think for this I ought to receive from you £100 or from you and Aza £150—this would be a fortune to me. . . .

If from this proposal one sentiment injurious to me pass across your mind—still it instantly. . . . I know John that you must respect me, that you would willingly give me any money—or anything in your power. I am ready to receive assistance from my friends when I cannot support myself;—but till this happens I should not sleep as contented as I now do, were I to receive one farthing.

I am in haste . . . Farewell. You are a good man. God bless you.

BASIL MONTAGU.

P.S.

Do not forget to send me £5.

BM

The proposal was not accepted, however, and Montagu's needs compelled him to borrow from his pupil, whose once benevolent dispositions had so much suffered from the "pollution of the counting house" that after the lapse of some time he had the baseness to suggest repayment. Such a mercantile act was not to be tolerated, and Montagu wrote with "tears in his eyes" that all intimacy between them was at an end for ever. One paragraph in his letter arrests our particular attention:

. . . If I comply with your request I must render Wordsworth

miserable. I love Wordsworth more than any human being; my obligations to him are, at least equal to my obligations to you; he is, and I am in poverty, you are in affluence: I will not therefore occasion uneasiness to that good & able man. . . .

This letter concludes with a promise to send a bond payable on demand for the whole sum of the debt, but either the bond was not sent or it was not paid, for in a letter postmarked April 2, 1800, Montagu is still promising payment with offended dignity:

I shall be in Town to-morrow, & shall be able to send you £20 as soon as I arrive. More I cannot send.—I must and will remit a few pounds to that good man Wordsworth. . . .

. . . after your last letter, all intimacy between us is at an end forever. . . . I have anxiously endeavoured to promote your welfare & my sensations at this moment are my reward for the whole of my conduct to you. You may yield to momentary deception: but in hours of retirement you will hereafter often reflect upon the firmness & exertions of

BASIL MONTAGU.

But whatever his creditor may have thought of his firmness, he presumably did not regard his exertions as sufficient, and must have pressed further for payment, for within a very short time Montagu wrote to him again at great length and went over the whole story of his misfortunes in detail.¹ He had failed to secure a fellowship at Cambridge because he "*had been* under the influence of the Sentiments contained in the Political Justice." "I do not murmur at this," he adds; "I am satisfied that it is the duty of every well-wisher to the Happiness of Society to excite as far as he is able, a general horror at the sentiments contained in that work." None the less, he felt that he might have been preferred by "more Acuteness or more Benevolence." This, however, was the neglect of strangers and moved him not, but, oh, how keenly he is wounded by the unkindness of a man "whom as a Brother I have loved, as a Father I have endeavoured to serve and to instruct!"

He dwells on their past intimacy. In an hour of need Pinney had agreed to lend him £500:

From that Instant I determined to do the utmost in my power to return your kindness by a mode which no money could buy. . . . I resolved to direct your benevolent dispositions . . . my necessities compelled me to

¹ These excerpts are from a long letter from Montagu to John Frederick Pinney. It is undated and unsigned, and only one full folio sheet of it has yet been found, but from the date of a letter of Pinney's which he copies into his own letter, it is apparent that the letter was written after April 9, 1800.

call upon you for £400 : my resolution to exert myself on your behalf continued unaltered ; but, knowing the ascendancy which I have ever gained over all men with whom I lived, I commanded myself never to burden you more during the time we cohabited together. . . . After we had separated for a few months . . . you will recollect that I, who had been accustomed to luxuries & Splendor, was living in a Garret for three months, without a farthing in my pocket ; and sometimes for three successive days, scarcely any sustenance. . . . I wrote to you for £20. . . .

In October Last, threatened to be sent to Goal . . . I applied to you for £100. . . . It turned out that your inclination to serve me was greater than your ability : but you then requested to be responsible to Wordsworth for his annuity. I did not accept your offer.—The certainty of going to prison unless I paid the sum of £40 impelled me to conjure you to join with me in a note for that sum at six weeks ; without distressing Wordsworth I knew that I could not pay the note when due : I told you, indeed, that I should have money to pay it ; but that if I appropriated money to this purpose I should be acting wrong as the consequences would be injurious to Wordsworth. You undertook to write to Wordsworth for the loan of £100 upon your and Lane's security on my Account. . . .

Pinney, however, did not write to Wordsworth, and Montagu, pressed for funds, requested a friend to discount a bill upon Pinney for £40. There was apparently some misunderstanding about this that led to even more bitter words. "I declare before God," Montagu protests, "that I considered the matter as finally settled : & I acted accordingly : I wrote to Wordsworth & told him that he might rely upon receiving £1 10s. weekly from Lady-Day. . . ."

Two years later the demands, explanations and protests were still being exchanged, though Montagu's tone had become more irritable :

. . . I cannot however refrain from expressing my astonishment at your accusation against me of having been disrespectful to you.—Respect is a tribute due from a inferior to a superior. . . .

As to the demand for £120 . . . though I may eventually be put to great inconvenience, and be prevented from doubling this year the payment which I made to my worthy friend William Wordsworth during the last year ; yet there is no distress to which I will not submit rather than disappoint you, and Wordsworth will, I know readily encounter any difficulty so occasioned.

Pinney had apparently demanded some security for Montagu's promises, for he gives a list of clergymen and fellows of colleges who will "joyfully" join him in any security. He concludes with a parting shot—"Mercantile connections I have not any."

It was Montagu who in earlier and happier days had introduced

Wordsworth to the Pinneys and probably had suggested the arrangement whereby Wordsworth came to live at Racedown Lodge.

Racedown, or Pylemarsh, Lodge,¹ had been the source of much trouble to John Pinney. From the time of his return to Bristol from the West Indies, when he first planned to make it "a leepport in a storm," he had been involved in endless quarrels with carpenters and masons and the neighbouring farmers. Not the least of his troubles had been the problem of a caretaker. The house when finished had been well furnished. It was necessary to have some one living in it, yet he and the other members of his family found it possible to be there only a small part of the year. Furthermore, there was a brickyard connected with the place which required the presence of a manager.

Joseph Gill, a ne'er-do-well cousin, had been installed at first, but he did not remain long. The merchant then tried his father-in-law, William Burt Weekes, but Weekes had his own opinions of the manner in which the house should be remodelled, and after remonstrances and protests that fill many a page of the ponderous letter-books of the old merchant, he too departed.

By 1793 the family had abandoned all intentions of making the lodge any sort of a permanent home, and it was advertised to be let for £42 per annum. No one seemed to desire it, however, and it continued to be a problem. The old man therefore rented it to his son, John Frederick, at £50 a year, but he continued to exercise control over it. One Hicks, with his wife, was put in charge, but in December 1794 she died. Early in 1795 a Betty Dally was employed for a guinea and a half a year and her own cottage rent-free to air the house and keep it clean. When any member of the family came down she was to have other duties and an extra stipend of two shillings a week.

John Frederick decided, without the knowledge or consent of his father, to allow William and Dorothy to live at Racedown Lodge rent-free. The reason for this decision is not clear, but it was probably a result of the sons' dealings with Basil Montagu. There was perhaps an added inducement in that when the young people went into Dorset for shooting or other diversion they would always find congenial company and their board at the lodge. It is evident that John Pinney thought Wordsworth was to pay rent, for

¹ The name was changed in 1790.

he writes to Joseph Gill on September 10, 1795, asking if the house is ready for its tenant :

At the same time inform me whether Betty Dally washed all the Linen in time and cleared the whole house properly before the arrival of Mr. Wordsworth and acquaint me whether the Gardener has weeded all the Hedges, and put the Garden in good order, and whether everything looks as it ought—pray examine every part of the Hedges in a particular manner and fully describe their appearance.¹

Joseph Gill, subdued by years of adversity, was now in charge of the brickyard, and he seems to have been made responsible for the house as well—even of the dishes, for Dorothy had to ask him for an extra tumbler or a knife and fork at the arrival of a guest. Gill did not lodge at the house, however, but at Harlescombe, a farm a few hundred yards below in the valley, the oldest property of the Pinneys. Since Wordsworth neither paid or was paid there are scarcely any records of his stay to be found among the masses of family papers and accounts which have been preserved. Joseph Gill, however, kept a sort of journal or day-book in which he noted the number of bricks sold each day and anything else, seemingly, that occurred to him. It is a disappointing document. The references to the Wordsworths are few and trivial. He makes no mention whatever of young Basil Montagu or of the visits of Mary Hutchinson and Coleridge. Yet from some few notes of his, some family documents, and several fragments and copies of letters which have been preserved it is possible to glean a little new information concerning the Racedown years.

The house was a plain, Georgian house of three stories, built of red and mulberry home-made bricks, but covered in part at that time with a grey stucco or rough-casting. The advertisement of 1793 tells us that there were two parlours, a kitchen, scullery, pantry, servants' hall, and butler's pantry on the ground floor. There were four excellent bed-chambers with closets and a large light closet on the chamber floor and four more bed-chambers on the attic floor. There were two good cellars, a wash-house, brewhouse, adequate stabling, and "two necessaries."²

¹ In a letter dated July 27, 1795, to Sam Whitty of Sherborne, John Pinney writes: "My Son having let Race Down house to a friend of his, and as I could not conveniently go down myself to adjust matters there, before the coming in of the Tenant, I have sent him to do the business, and he will accordingly set off this morning."

² The house hardly deserved M. Legouis's "destitute of beauty." One cannot help feeling that M. Legouis in his description of Racedown and Dorset is trying

The house was well furnished, for the merchant had originally intended it for his own residence. The inventory list of furniture in the breakfast room or common parlour, which Dorothy called "the prettiest little room that can be,"¹ shows everything to have been very comfortable, if a little solid. The chairs, the table, a tea chest, reading stand, and two bookcases were of mahogany. There was a leather "sopha," a pier glass in a gilded frame, a pianoforte, two blue and white delft flower stands, and a delft bottle. The hearth was well and cheerfully furnished. The room had oilcloth on the floor, though there was a good Axminster carpet in the best parlour. The dinner service was of Queen's ware.

Not the least important of the furnishings were the books, with which the house was well stocked. A great part of the four hundred volumes listed in a special inventory was taken up with theology and history, yet there was a surprising store of English and other classics—Virgil, Pliny, Tacitus, Seneca, Cicero, Boccaccio, Beaumont and Fletcher, Speed, Milton, Dryden, Sandys, Burnet, Glover, Buckingham, Swift, Prior, Aubrey, Blackmore, and Bysshe's *Art of Poetry*, to name but the outstanding ones.

One of Wordsworth's first duties after arriving at Racedown was to check over an inventory of the articles in the house, a duty which he performed with a more careful eye for cracked plates and broken chairs than one usually associates with the poetic temperament. Still, on £70 or £80 a year one can't afford to pay for other people's carelessness. "Mr. Wordsworth has taken a call over all the things in the house," Joseph Gill notes in his journal for September 29, 1795, "and certified it on the inventory—therefore as he says, he is now answerable for y^e whole." Wordsworth's care with the inventory seems amusing to us, but then we are not living on £70 a year, nor are we answerable to John Pinney. Beside a perplexing list of weights for the kitchen scales he has written, "Not well understood. W.W.," and where Joseph had listed "Tin-tinder box candlestick compleat," he has underscored "compleat" and

to present a sombre background for Wordsworth's spiritual struggles (*Early Life of William Wordsworth*, translated by T. W. Matthews, London, 1897, pp. 184, 285). Against the gloomy picture which M. Legouis paints may be set Dorothy's statement that Racedown was "the place dearest to my recollection upon the whole surface of the Island" (*Life of William Wordsworth*, by William Knight, LL.D., Edinburgh, 1889, p. 106), and the general tone of cheerfulness which pervades her letters and those of her brother written from Racedown.

¹ *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ed. Knight, London, 1907, 3 vols. Vol. i, p. 91, Letter XLII.

noted, "wanting a steel." He calls attention in the margin to the fact that one of the Queen's ware dishes is cracked and four of the others broken, a wine-glass missing, two salt savers broken, two of the butter pots gone to Bristol, the pier glass in the best sitting-room "injured," and the blue and white delft bottle missing. The mahogany chair in the man-servant's room was broken, too, and the "Perambulator in a case"¹ is marked "the handle broken, W.W." The linen, of which there was a plentiful supply, was kept under the bookcase in a drawer under the care of Betty Dally. It is noted that one towel was "brought by Miss Wordsworth from Bristol," and a later hand adds that one sheet is missing and queries if Mr. Wordsworth had used it for a tablecloth.

Here, at Racedown, Wordsworth wrote *The Borderers* and revised *Guilt and Sorrow*, and tried his hand at satire. Among the peasants, miserably poor, he saw poor Margaret at her monotonous drudgery, and here he may have seen Goody Blake gathering sticks, or even making away with the new front fence itself, to Joseph Gill's great indignation. His letters and Dorothy's give a clear picture of their severe and restricted, though not unhappy life. It is, however, not the purpose of this paper to present a full picture of those days. This has been well done by M. Legouis, Professors Knight and Harper, and others, and nothing would be gained from a repetition of their quotations from the Wordsworth letters and their conjectures based on these letters.

Soon after the arrival of Dorothy and William the old merchant and his wife drove over from Bristol to pay them a visit. They do not seem to have called often, but the young men made frequent visits and stayed for weeks at a time. Aware of Wordsworth's limited means, they insisted on paying for their board :

My brother desires me to say (wrote Azariah in November of their first year), he shall not visit Racedown upon any other terms than were agreed on by you and him in London—if it be not inconvenient James Tobin will accompany him—don't let politeness supersede your love of truth, so as to induce you to say it will be convenient, if it be not so.

¹ *Perambulator*.—"A machine for measuring distances, consisting of a large wheel trundled by a handle along the ground, with attached clockwork and dial for recording the revolutions. *Obs.*"—*N.E.D.*

First reference to the modern "pram" in *N.E.D.* is 1857.

This inventory has been known to the family for some time, and is usually shown to visitors. It is of interest that Thomas Hardy was the first to suggest what the perambulator really was.

Wordsworth had apparently impressed them with his poetical abilities, for Azariah adds :

If you find leisure & inclination, and will write a few lines panegyric of the object of Jack's attachment, whose name is composed of three syllables, I will most sincerely thank you, and I am persuaded he would consider it as a great obligation.

The visits of the young men were gay interludes in the uneventful life at Racedown. Their arrival is always marked in Gill's journal by the giving out of wine glasses, tumblers, and decanters to "Miss W" from his "lock up room." The young men shared and seemed to relish the life of the Wordsworths¹—their daily walks and evenings by the fire—but they also enticed them to join in their own favourite sport of hunting—even Dorothy went a coursing! Some account of one of their visits is given in a letter from the younger brother to James Tobin :

. . . After I left London I remained three weeks with Wordsworth at Racedown, who desired me to say how happy it will make him to see you there—but not to expect anything more than democratic fair.²—His Salisbury Plain is so much altered that I think it may in truth be called a new poem—I brought it with me to Bristol—It is now at Coleridge's, by whom it has been attentively read and pronounced a very fine poem. . . . While we were with him he relaxed the rigour of his philosophic nerves so much as to go a Coursing several times, & I assure you did not eat the unfortunate Hares with less relish because he heard them heave their death groans, and saw their eyes directed toward Heaven with that glare of vacant sadness which belongs to the expiring creature—for his usual appetite showed itself at the dining table.—Miss Wordsworth has undoubted claim to good humour, but does not possess, in my opinion, that *je ne sais quoi*, so necessary to sweeten the sour draught of human misfortune.³

The Pinneys formed a link with Coleridge at Bristol and several times carried poems and letters to him.

You would have heard from me before (wrote Azariah on March the 25th, 1796, to Wordsworth), but I waited to collect all the intelligence, that was in my power, concerning the publication of your Poem. I delivered it on my arrival here to Cottle and requested that Coleridge

¹ See Dorothy's letter, vol. i, p. 99 of the *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, Letter No. XLIV.

² This was Aza whose spelling had so distressed his father earlier.

³ Dorothy thought Aza "much more pleasing than the generality of young men," but added, "he is not so great a favourite with me as his brother."—Letter to Mrs. Marshall, February 1, 1796. This passage is omitted in the Knight edition of the *Letters*.

would inspect it, which he appears to have done with considerable attention for I understand he has interleaved it with white paper to mark down whatever may strike him as worthy your notice and intends forwarding it to you in that form; To avoid expense he promised to enclose it in the first parcel, that is sent from his Bookseller's to Gidley at Crewkerne. I gave him your address—you may expect to hear from him soon, but lest this should come to your hand before any communication from him; I have the pleasure to inform you that he feels so lively an interest to bring forward so valuable a Poem (as he terms it) that he assures me his Bookseller will assist him in such a manner in the publication that he can secure you from every expense, without risk to himself and you will receive the profits that may arise after the expenses are paid. He recommends having 500 copies struck instead of 250. He is now engaged in a weekly publication entitled the *Watchman*, the method he intends to adopt in the sale of your work is, to persuade his Bookseller to get the People that sell the *Watchman* to take a few copies of your Poem, by which means he can ascertain, how far it be practicable, to publish it without hazard to any party.

The unfortunate hares mentioned in the earlier letter were possibly eaten with an even greater relish than the guests at Racedown had any idea of. The Wordsworths were living on the narrowest possible margin, and meat did not appear very often on their table. Dorothy is very sanguine in her letter to Miss Pollard, written before she and William went to Racedown,¹ but we know that the little girl she hoped to take care of was not sent, and their hopes of having a younger son of the Pinneys' under their care were also disappointed. Certain passages in Montagu's letters, which have been quoted earlier, suggest all too plainly that young Basil instead of representing an addition to their income was probably one more mouth to feed. In the letter which he wrote to Sir George Beaumont in 1805, in which Wordsworth gives an account of their early struggles and finances, he makes no mention of payment from Montagu.² Other passages in Montagu's letters previously quoted imply that even the annuity was in some way dependent upon him, and at times uncertain of payment.

Their diet was often purely vegetable. "The copy of your poem you will continue to frank," Wordsworth wrote to Francis Wrangham in 1795, "else, ten to one, I shall not be able to release it from the Post Office. I have lately been living upon air and the essence of carrots, cabbages, turnips and other esculent vegetables,"³ and to

¹ *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, vol. i, No. XL.

² *Ibid.*, No. XCIII., vol. i, pp. 179, 180.

³ *Ibid.*, Letter XLIII, vol. i, p. 92.

another friend he later wrote, "You may perhaps suspect that into cabbages we shall be transformed."¹ Some of the entries in Joseph Gill's journal present a picture still more dire :

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Dec. 12th. 1796. | Truly most dismal weather. |
| 24th. | Very rough snowy weather—
Hitch's Cow
I cannot eat the beef—must therefore go away
somewhere. |
| 26th. | Treatment at Harlescombe damn'd bad.
Cruel hard to be starv'd to death in a Christian
Country. |
| Jan. 7th. 1797. | Severe frosty weather. Cakes or bread made from
the beastly milk of a cow when she calves without
any butter to it for breakfast & supper, with tea to
which no sugar is allowed, & Carrion Beef of a cow
that dyed in calving for dinner—Water to drink
w th it alone. |

Gill's journal does not on the whole present a very pleasant picture of life at Racedown during these years, but some allowance must be made for the feelings of a ruined and unhappy man reduced to what he regarded as virtual slavery.

Since Joseph Gill was in daily communication with the Wordsworths for eighteen months, often, perhaps, their only companion, some account of him may not be amiss. He was, as has been said, a cousin of John Pinney, the Bristol merchant, and had been for some time engaged in the West Indies, partly in his own interests and partly as an overseer for his cousin. He fell a prey to drink and soon incurred debts that consumed all he had. Members of his family came to his rescue, but not without a great deal of worldly-wise head-wagging at his complete fulfilment of their darkest prophecies. One debt in particular seemed to irritate his wiser and wealthier cousin : he had borrowed £100 with which he had purchased the freedom of a mulatto woman, Penny Markham. He had returned to England, but in such a state from drink and drugs that he had been detained for some time as a patient at a farm at Halstock. His plight had at first aroused sympathy, and various attempts were made to assist him. He had been placed at Racedown (then Pylemarsh Lodge) in the eighties, but he had run away to London, indulged in a spree, been robbed of his money, and ended up in the Round House.

¹ *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, Letter XLVII, vol. i, p. 106.

After this exploit his name disappears from the family records for some years. He may have returned to the West Indies, but only for a short stay, as we find him back at Racedown as overseer of the brickyard and manager of the farm when Wordsworth arrives. His age at this time is uncertain, but he was probably well past middle age. He does not seem to have received any wages, but his status was above that of a servant. His diary shows that he visited and dined out with the Pinneys as an equal, though he did not take his meals at Racedown, but boarded at Harlescombe, the farm below, with old John Hitchcock, whom he mortally hated. The merchant paid his board of eight shillings a week. His weakness for drink apparently continued, for one of the diversions of the young gentlemen was to get him drunk. On one occasion, at least, Joseph suspected them of having drugged his drink.

Yet he was by no means a mere dull sot. He was a man of more education than one would suspect from his position, and of some intellectual interests. There are several copies of letters in which, urging his cousin to make some provision for his old age, his most earnest request is to be placed with an old sea-captain of his acquaintance, that he might spend his last days with one who could provide intellectual companionship. He subscribed at one time to the *Town and Country Magazine*, and possessed a store of these and some old newspapers, which he seemed to prize.

On Saturday, September 26, 1795, he notes in his journal, "at Midnight arriv'd Mr. & Miss Wordsworth," and adds that he gave Betty Dally a tablecloth and sheets and two tea and two tablespoons. The newcomers are busy for the next day or two arranging about their butter and milk and calling over the inventory. Five shillings is wasted sending a man to Lyme Regis for coal, for he can get none. Joseph has his own troubles with a saucy gardener and with John Hitchcock's cows breaking into the kitchen garden. On October 5 he is sent to Crewkerne with letters, and pays two shillings for the post.

On October 20 Joseph waited on the Pinneys of Blackdown, the nearest neighbours of any social consequence, and kinsmen of the Bristol Pinneys, "partly on the desire of Miss Wordsworth," who seemed to feel that the Blackdown Pinneys should have called on her before. Her overtures were not too warmly received. Mrs. Pinney of Blackdown merely replied that "she cannot buy Miss P—y's pianoforte." Dorothy was determined to do the proper thing,

however, and had them down to dinner when the young men from Bristol were visiting the first Christmas. "And very dull it was," she wrote to Mrs. Marshall.¹ They reciprocated with a dinner at their house to which Joseph Gill was also invited—and then are heard of no more.

Letters and parcels came from Bristol at intervals. Gill was occupied from November 16 to February 7 in a protracted war with the hated John Hitchcock over a hay knife. Some diversion was supplied by young Sam Hitchcock getting himself put in jail in London. Joseph at once put a lien on his property in the merchant's name. Mr. Wordsworth had been complaining about wanting several jobs done, but the complaints of Mr. Wordsworth no more moved the obdurate gardener than the commands of Mr. Gill. "My saying anything to him this long time," Joseph notes bitterly, "has been as useless as it would be to sing Psalms to a dead horse." Eventually he and Wordsworth were compelled to do their own odd jobs, for there are entries in the journal thereafter of days spent in gardening and getting Mr. Wordsworth to help with the walks. Even Dorothy could not move the gardener's stubborn heart, and on one occasion, at least, hired a boy herself to cut the grass.

Dorothy seems to have been dependent on Gill for all of her supplies. "Feb. 11. Miss Wordsworth had the Jar of sugar out of my room" is a typical entry in the journal. And apparently she had to give some account of these things:

Feb. 18th. Miss W—h says all is put up except knives and forks.

But Dorothy probably won his heart. On March 8 is a simple entry: "Miss Words^b lik^d the things," and when William was away in London in June 1796, Gill walked into Crewkerne with her three times, and lent her two shillings, probably to pay the postage on William's letter. Even the unruly John Hitchcock came under her spell, if we may judge that much from a note in Gill's journal for May 15:

On Friday J. Hitchcock went to Lyme for coal for M^{rs} Wordsworth with less difficulty than was expected as his wife has said he should not go.

The distance to Crewkerne and back which the Wordsworths had to walk for their mail was fourteen miles. Dorothy mentions it

¹ *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, vol. i, p. 180.

several times in her letters with an air of sureness (and even a hint of pride) that is well justified, for a note in Gill's journal tells us that she had trudged the whole way pushing the perambulator to make certain.

Poor as Joseph was, in some respects he was richer than the other inmates of Racedown. His *Town and Country Magazine* served "for Mr. Wordsworth's amusement" in the first dreary winter, and the "Entertainers" from his newspapers were often in demand—sometimes for less noble purposes than recreating the poetic mind, as when Mr. John Frederick Pinney used a part of the precious hoard "to pack up his picture of Leda naked for Bristol." This "beautiful picture of Leda naked in a gilt frame" was one of the cherished possessions which John Pretor had inherited from his cousins thirty years before when he took their name. Perhaps Dorothy did not approve of it. It would seem that at least once Wordsworth himself hoped to appear in the columns of the "Entertainer" as Joseph has a memo., "Mr. P. of Blackdown to send Mr. W— poem in to the Entertainer."

There are several instances in Gill's journal of money having been lent to the Wordsworths. One is particularly intriguing: "Dec. 24th [1796] Miss W^s Diary 10^d." When Joseph lacked money of his own he sometimes lent that of his employer: "Nov. 21st [1796] Lent Mr. W. a guinea of the brick money"—a proceeding which one imagines would cause considerable annoyance to the old merchant, so meticulous in his accounts.

There is no doubt that the life at Racedown had its drawbacks, though on the whole it was probably a very happy time for the brother and sister. Certainly their letters reflect no unhappiness, however annoying may have been their poverty or the endless bickerings with their neighbours and the confusion of the brickyard. No certain reason can be given for their departure, but the probability is that John Pinney discovered the easy terms on which his son was allowing the Wordsworths to live at Racedown. A paragraph in a letter dated March 1796 from one of the sons to Wordsworth suggests that this was the reason, and leaves no doubt of the old gentleman's sentiments concerning the matter:

We were obliged to let my father into a knowledge of the whole transaction relative to the deficiency in the cash I received for him at Racedown, as circumstances rendered it impracticable to conceal it effectually from him. We did it as gradually as possible, but all our

precautions did not disappoint his anger—for some time he was so hurt that he determined to write to Mr. Perkins his attorney to desire he would call on you for the money, but at our earnest request he relinquished the intention.

Notwithstanding this display of indignation and the prospect of better-paying tenants¹ for the house, the Wordsworths remained at Racedown until the summer of the following year, when they joined Coleridge at Nether Stowey. That they parted good friends with their landlord is shown by a letter which John Pinney wrote to Perkins on August 15, 1797:

. . . as Mr. Wordsworth wrote to my Son and advised him of his intention of leaving Race-down, I have no doubt but he has left everything in a Proper state . . . when the Potatoes, wh^b Mr. Wordsworth writes he has left growing for my son, are ripe, have them dug up and put away in my Cellar.

* ¹ Joseph Gill records in his journal during September, 1796, that inquiries were being made by prospective tenants.

THE NUMBER OF LINES IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS¹

By ALFRED HART

THE PROBLEM

DURING the progress of an investigation which I was making into the average length of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays, I found it necessary to count the number of lines in each of Shakespeare's plays; on comparing my results—I used the Cambridge edition of 1863-1866—with those obtained by Fleay from the same text in the Globe edition, I was struck with the great differences between our totals for most of the plays. Some of his totals were undoubtedly incorrect, and yet were being quoted as correct by various critics. It may, of course, be reasonably argued that any computer may, if he has taken the trouble to add up carefully, fairly claim for his own results that they are as accurate and authoritative as those obtained by any other person from any other edition. It must be conceded that no one set of such figures deserves any preference over any other set, and that a critic is entitled to use any figures that he pleases, provided that he tells his readers the source from which he obtained them. On the other hand, want of uniformity makes for confusion, misunderstanding and error, and a standard set of such totals, if generally accepted, would be of some advantage to students of the drama who may need them. I propose to indicate certain peculiarities of the totals obtained from the Globe edition which make them, in my opinion, unsuitable for comparative work, and I shall suggest the adoption of another set of totals based on the simple principle of requiring that the line of dramatic prose shall be, for purposes of counting, as nearly as possible equivalent in word-value to the line of blank verse.

¹ [This article was received in London on July 20, 1931. As the author resides in Australia, it has been printed without submitting proofs to him for correction.—Ed. R.E.S.]

FLEAY'S TABLES

Fleay is the author of what is almost the earliest modern table giving the number of lines in each of Shakespeare's plays. In his famous paper "On Metrical Tests as applied to Dramatic Poetry," read before the New Shakspeare Society in 1874, he gave a "Metrical Table of Shakspeare's Plays," in which were included columns stating the totals of lines, of prose, of blank verse, etc., for each of the plays. He used the text of the Globe edition. Though his metrical table was packed with blunders, it has had a wide acceptance because it was printed in his well-known *Shakespeare Manual*.¹ In 1880 Miss T. R. Smith and F. J. Furnivall² checked his figures for the "total" of lines in each play, and some years later Furnivall³ printed another table; this was a hotch-potch of his own and Fleay's figures and has no independent value. Mr. Morton Luce⁴ and Mr. Oliphant Smeaton⁵ gave wider dissemination and a longer lease of life to Fleay's errors by reprinting *verbatim* Fleay's metrical table in handbooks intended for students of Shakespeare. Finally, Sir E. K. Chambers⁶ gave all Fleay's figures a complete and much needed revision, and his tables printed as an appendix to the second volume of his *William Shakespeare* may be taken as the last word on the various totals based on the Globe edition. Opposite is a set of figures based on the Cambridge edition of 1863-1866; it gives the total number of lines and the number of lines of prose for each play. In the table Fleay's figures and those of Sir E. K. Chambers are placed side by side with mine for purpose of comparison. My own figures have been counted twice and are, I trust, substantially accurate; there will always be room for some difference of opinion in such work. As the text of the Globe edition is substantially that of the Cambridge edition, the number of lines of verse is the same in the two editions. For convenience of reference the order of the plays is that found in the tables in *William Shakespeare*.

¹ *Shakespeare Manual*, 1878, pp. 135-6 and p. 259.

² *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*, 1880-1885, Appendix I, 3.

³ *Leopold Shakspeare*, n.d. Introduction, p. cxxviii.

⁴ *Handbook of Shakespeare's Works*, 1906, p. 455.

⁵ *Shakespeare, His Life and Work*, n.d. (c. 1916), pp. 540-41.

⁶ *William Shakespeare* (1930), vol. ii, pp. 398-405.

NUMBER OF LINES IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS 21

TABLE I

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF LINES AND THE NUMBER OF PROSE LINES IN EACH OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

Name of play.	Total number of lines.			Number of prose lines.		
	Cam- bridge edition.	Globe edition.		Cam- bridge edition.	Globe edition.	
	Hart.	Fleay.	Chambers.	Hart.	Fleay.	Chambers.
2 <i>Hen. VI</i> ..	3,069	3,032	3,162	473	448	551
3 <i>Hen. VI</i> ..	2,904	2,904	2,904	—	—	3
<i>Rich. III</i> ..	3,600	3,599	3,619	69	57	83
<i>C.E.</i> ..	1,753	1,770	1,777	223	240	244
<i>T.G.</i> ..	2,193	2,060	2,292	571	409	654
<i>L.L.L.</i> ..	2,651	2,789	2,785	892	1,086	1,051
<i>R.J.</i> ..	2,989	3,002	3,050	401	405	455
<i>Rich. II</i> ..	2,755	2,644	2,757	—	—	—
<i>M.N.D.</i> ..	2,102	2,251	2,174	400	441	470
<i>John</i> ..	2,570	2,553	2,570	—	—	—
<i>M.V.</i> ..	2,554	2,705	2,658	515	673	633
1 <i>Hen. IV</i> ..	2,968	3,170	3,176	1,289	1,464	1,493
2 <i>Hen. IV</i> ..	3,180	3,437	3,446	1,617	1,860	1,813 (a)
<i>M.A.</i> ..	2,535	2,823	2,825	1,808	2,106	2,105
<i>Hen. V</i> ..	3,166	3,320	3,381	1,235	1,531	1,440 (b)
<i>J.C.</i> ..	2,450	2,440	2,477	160	165	176
<i>A.Y.L.</i> ..	2,608	2,904	2,856	1,438	1,681	1,659 (c)
<i>T.N.</i> ..	2,429	2,684	2,690	1,485	1,741	1,752
<i>Ham.</i> ..	3,762	3,924	3,929	1,047	1,208	1,211
<i>M.W.</i> ..	2,634	3,018	3,018	2,307	2,703	2,664 (d)
<i>T.C.</i> ..	3,329	3,423	3,496	1,010	1,186	1,188
<i>A.W.</i> ..	2,738	2,981	2,966	1,292	1,453	1,478
<i>M.M.</i> ..	2,660	2,809	2,820	1,018	1,134	1,154
<i>Oth.</i> ..	3,229	3,324	3,316	591	541	685
<i>Lear</i> ..	3,205	3,298	3,328	844	903	925
<i>Mac.</i> ..	2,084	1,993	2,106	141	158	158
<i>A.C.</i> ..	3,016	3,904	3,059	264	255	287
<i>Cor.</i> ..	3,279	3,392	3,406	726	829	829
<i>Cy.</i> ..	3,264	3,448	3,339	450	638	526
<i>W.T.</i> ..	2,925	2,750	3,074	758	844	876
<i>Tr.</i> ..	2,015	2,068	2,062	442	458	464
1 <i>Hen. VI</i> ..	2,676	2,693	2,677	—	—	2
<i>T.A.</i> ..	2,522	2,525	2,523	38	43	41
<i>T.S.</i> ..	2,552	2,671	2,647	450	516	625
<i>Tim.</i> ..	2,299	2,358	2,374	640	596	701
<i>Per.</i> ..	2,331	2,386	2,393	432	418	477
<i>Hen. VIII (e)</i> ..	2,807	2,754	2,819	63	67	81

NOTES : (a) Thirty-seven lines of prose in the epilogue omitted from the total of prose. If added, total is 1,850 lines.

(b) Does this total exclude the prose of Pistol's part ?

(c) If the twenty-four lines of epilogue be added, prose equals 1,683 lines.

(d) Does this total omit Pistol's bombast in prose ?

(e) *Edward III* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* are not included in my count.

In the aggregate 25,091 lines of prose in the Cambridge edition equals 28,954 lines of prose in the Globe—the figures counted being those of Sir E. K. Chambers—an increase of 15·4 per cent. The consequent increase in the average length of all the plays amounts to 104 lines per play; for the 31 plays above the line the increase in the average length is 115 lines per play.

SOME DISADVANTAGES OF FLEAY'S TABLE

It is unfortunate that so many computers have followed Fleay in his choice of the Globe edition for counting the number of lines in the plays. The volume is a crown octavo in size, and the text is printed in double columns, each two inches in width, with the result that the number of lines obtained for nearly all the plays that contain prose greatly exceeds the total which would be obtained from any other edition that I have examined. The "lining" of the verse in the Globe edition is practically identical with that in the Cambridge edition, but 1,000 lines of prose in the latter extends to 1,154 lines in the former. *The Merry Wives* contains a higher proportion of prose than any other of the plays, and in consequence the various totals obtained for it from different editions exhibit very clearly how much the width of the text in the page, the size of the type, the spacing of the letters in the words and the spread of the words in the line affect the number of lines which a scene in prose occupies. How large these differences may be will be evident from the following table.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF LINES IN *The Merry Wives*

First Folio (1623) (Booth's reprint)	..	2,659 lines
Tonson's edition (1735)	..	2,684 "
First Edinburgh edition (1753)	..	2,815 "
Valpy's edition (1842)	..	2,931 "
Knight's cabinet edition (1843)	..	2,803 "
Cambridge edition (1864)	..	2,634 "
Globe edition (1864)	..	3,018 "
Dyce's second edition (1864)	..	2,568 "
Rolfe's edition (1888)	..	2,587 "
Whitehall edition (1890)	..	2,735 "
"New" (Cambridge) edition (1921) (a)	..	2,668 "

NOTE.—(a) Forty-nine lines of editorial stage-directions inserted in the body of the text have been deducted.

Which of these totals should we accept? A critic is entitled to choose the highest provided he tell his readers that he has done so.

Two other tests of a similar kind were made. First, the number of lines in the first scene of the play was counted in each of twenty editions ; the Globe gave the highest total. In the second, the total number of words in four long speeches was divided by the number of lines in the speeches. The Globe gave a smaller number of words per full prose line than any other of the editions. The logical consequence is that the average length of Shakespeare's plays, computed from the totals obtained from the Globe edition, must exceed the average length determined from any one of the other 19 editions ; the average length of the 31 plays above the line in Table I is (the figures of Sir E. K. Chambers are used) :

Globe edition, 2,920 lines a play.

Cambridge edition, 2,794 lines a play.

The corresponding averages for the 37 plays are :

Globe edition, 2,864 lines a play.

Cambridge edition, 2,752 lines a play.

The Globe edition gives the highest " totals " because the average number of words per line in long prose scenes is the lowest ; it is 7 words a line as against a little over 8 words in the Cambridge edition. The number of words to the full prose line of the Globe edition, viz. 9, is also the lowest for all the 20 editions examined ; long continuous speeches in the Cambridge edition average nearly 11 words to the line.

The use of the very high Globe totals makes for much perplexity, confusion and even error. In the first place, the figures for certain plays will not bear close scrutiny and contradict the evidence of our senses. In every one of about 30 editions of the plays which I have examined—even in the Globe edition itself—*The Merry Wives* (3,018 lines) fills about the same number of pages as 1 *Henry VI*, said to be 341 lines shorter—and anything from 5 to 20 pages less than 3 *Henry VI* (2,904 lines). *King John* (2,570 lines) usually takes up as many leaves as *Much Ado* (2,825 lines) ; and I have not come across an edition in which *Twelfth Night* (2,690 lines) stretches to as many pages as 1 *Henry VI* (2,677 lines). On the stage *Romeo and Juliet* (3,050 lines) usually takes at least fifteen minutes longer to act than the *Merry Wives* (3,018 lines), and *King Richard II* (2,757 lines) would certainly require ten minutes more than *Much Ado* (2,825 lines) for complete representation. In the second place, if we wish to compare the length of plays (containing some prose) written by

other dramatists with the length of Shakespeare's plays, we cannot use the totals of the Globe edition. Its full prose line averages about 9 words a line, whereas the average of the full prose line in Collins's edition of Greene and Lucas's *Webster* is slightly over 11 words a line, 10 $\frac{2}{3}$ words a line in Bullen's editions of the dramatists, nearly 11 words in Parrott's editions of Chapman and Marlowe and in Herford and Simpson's *Jonson*, almost 12 words per line in Waller's *Beaumont and Fletcher* and Bond's *Lyly*, and almost 10 words in Pearson's editions of Dekker and Heywood. We are comparing two sets of totals, based on two entirely different standards, if we compute the length of Shakespeare's plays on a full prose line of 9 words and that of the plays written by other dramatists on a full prose line of 11 words—the totals of the latter will be considerably understated. The figures quoted above suggest that the Cambridge edition in which the full prose line averages very nearly 11 words a line is much more suitable for such comparative work. In the third place, the very high Globe figures have been used in support of such erroneous statements¹ as, "The normal length of a play for the London stage in Elizabethan days was about 3,000 lines."¹ This sweeping generalisation is quite new, and is true of Jonson's plays only; it is not of Fleay's invention. He arranged the Globe totals in descending order of magnitude, excluded from the count the 9 shortest plays—some of them because they were short—and found that the average length of the remaining 28 plays was 3,000 lines. Fleay² certainly had nothing else in mind than to use his figures to prove what at the time he held to be true of Shakespeare's plays; recent critics, without any further appeal to figures, declare that the normal length of an Elizabethan drama was 3,000 lines. The critics are guessing, and their guess is a bad one. It can be proved that the average length of all plays with sound texts written for representation on the public stage during the years 1590-1616 did not much exceed 2,500 lines, and that, apart from Shakespeare and Jonson, five dramatists only out of about forty wrote even one play of the alleged "normal length."

"STANDARD" TOTALS

The disadvantage of using the totals for Shakespeare, derived from the Globe edition, have been discussed at some length, because

¹ J. D. Wilson, *New Shakespeare, The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1921), p. 81.

² *Shakespeare Manual*, 1878, p. 259.

it is probably the most unsuitable edition that could have been chosen for this purpose. Objections, however, could probably be brought against any set of totals obtained from any other edition. To arrive at some uniform method of counting the lines of plays we need a "standard" prose line comparable with the blank-verse lines in fixity of word-value. Though Shakespeare's blank-verse line is almost infinitely variable and may contain any number of words from 3 to 12, the average number of words per line is remarkably constant, and does not vary very much at any period of his career. A test was made on long scenes in verse written at different periods of the poet's career; the text was that of the Cambridge edition. The results are given below in Table III.

TABLE III

THE NUMBER OF WORDS PER LINE IN BLANK VERSE

Play.	Scene.	Number of lines.	Number of words.	Words per line.
2 Hen. VI	Act III, Sc. i	383	3,048	7.95
Rich. III	Act I, Sc. iii	356	2,868	8.05
John	Act III, Sc. i	347	2,748	7.92
M.V.	Act IV, Sc. i	440	3,560	8.09
2 Hen. IV	Act IV, Sc. iv	373	2,943	7.9
	Sc. v			
M.A.	Act III, Sc. i	349	2,766	7.92
	Act IV, Sc. i			
J.C.	Act II, Sc. i	640	4,990	7.8
	Act IV, Sc. iii			
Oth.	Act I, Sc. iii	666	5,257	7.9
	Act V, Sc. ii			
Cy.	Act v, Sc. v	477	3,907	8.2
Tp.	Act I, Sc. ii	671	5,530	8.24
	Act v, Sc. i			
Totals ..		4,702	37,617	8.0

We shall not be far off the truth if we accept this average of 8 words to the lines of blank verse as the "standard" value in words of a line of blank verse in any of the plays; the greatest variation from the standard ranges from about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. below to about 3 per cent. above it. Accordingly, if we can find an edition of the plays in which the prose averages about 8 words to the line, we shall be able to express the number of lines of prose in the plays in units identical in word-value with the "standard" line of blank verse of 8 words. We shall then be able to attach to the statement that

Hamlet contains 3,762 lines (partly in verse, partly in prose) just as definite and as exact a quantitative meaning as to the statement that 2 *Henry VI*—written entirely in verse—is 2,904 lines in length. Certain preliminary tests showed that of well-known editions the Cambridge most nearly approached the prescribed condition of equality in the word-value of the prose and the verse line. To ascertain the average number of words in a line of prose as it appears in this text, the total number of words in all the prose of 13 plays was counted. The term "Standard" total of lines, which appears at the head of the column numbered IV, means the equivalent in prose lines, each exactly 8 words in length, of the number of counted prose lines found in the column numbered I.

TABLE IV
AVERAGE WORD-VALUE OF PROSE LINES IN PLAYS

Name of play.	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
	Number of prose lines.	Number of words.	Number of words per line.	"Standard" total of lines.	Lines of prose, Globe edition.
2 <i>Hen. VI</i>	473	3,859	8.16	482	551
<i>T.G.</i>	571	4,382	7.67	548	654
<i>M.N.D.</i>	401	3,201	8.0	401	470
<i>R.J.</i>	400	3,104	7.76	388	455
<i>M.V.</i>	511	4,542	8.88	567	633
<i>M.A.</i>	1,808	15,002	8.3	1,875	2,105
<i>M.W.</i>	2,307	18,473	8.0	2,307	2,703
<i>J.C.</i>	160	1,161	7.25	145	176
<i>Oth.</i>	591	4,946	8.37	618	685
<i>A.C.</i>	264	1,998	7.58	250	287
<i>Cy.</i>	450	3,887	8.64	486	526
<i>W.T.</i>	758	6,723	8.86	480	876
<i>Tp.</i>	442	3,455	7.82	432	464
Totals ..	9,136	74,733	8.18	9,339	10,585

NOTE.—In addition, scenes from 1 *Hen. IV*, *T.N.*, and *Ham.*, totalling in all 1,391 lines, gave as a result 11,374 words. The average for 10,527 lines of prose equals 8.18 words per line. The average for the Globe edition is 7.06 words per line of prose.

The resultant average of 8.18 words per prose line applies strictly only to the 13 plays on which it is based; it may, however, be accepted, I think, as substantially correct for all the plays of Shakespeare as they appear in the Cambridge edition. The figures in the table show that this average is subject to rather wide variations

both in single scenes and in complete plays; the average rises or falls with the presence or absence of long prose speeches. Thus we might anticipate that the prose line of *As You Like It*, which contains many long prose speeches, will have a higher value in words than the above average; on the other hand, the predominance of brisk, curt dialogue in *Twelfth Night* will reduce the average word-value of the prose line below the above average. No serious error, however, is made in the majority of totals if we assume that a line of prose in the Cambridge text may be taken as equivalent in word-value to a line of blank verse. It is true that the average line of prose is a little too long; 100 lines contain 18 words too many. But only one quarter of Shakespeare's text is in prose. To reduce the 25,091 lines of prose present in the Cambridge edition to lines exactly equal in length to the line of blank verse—that is, to lines 8 words long—we must add 564 lines to this total. If these were distributed evenly through the 37 plays, 15 lines would be added to the length of each. Consequently we commit an almost unappreciable error if we adopt the Cambridge text as the “standard” text and the Cambridge totals as the “standard” totals. I suggest that the figures for the Cambridge edition, given in Table I, might advantageously replace the Globe totals in Sir E. K. Chambers' *Metrical Tables*,¹ both in the number of lines in the plays and in the number of lines of prose; not the least change would be necessary in any other portion of his tables. The advantages of adopting these figures are not far to seek. Exact accuracy is neither possible nor necessary; but if we use an edition in which the average prose line is practically equivalent in word-value to the line of blank verse, then the statement that *A Midsummer Night's Dream* contains 2,102 lines carries with it a quantitative meaning which is wanting in the total (2,174 lines) obtained from the Globe edition. We can have every confidence in the assertion that 2 *Henry IV* (Cambridge edition) and *Every Man in His Humour* (Herford and Simpson) are of almost exactly equal length, because we know that the full prose line of each of these texts contains almost exactly 11 words; on the other hand, comparative counts must continue to be almost valueless so long as we are content to accept without demur the statement that *The Merry Wives* (3,018 lines, Globe edition) is barely 50 lines shorter than *The Alchemist*, which must contain at least 3,400 more words. Perhaps, too, critics will spend less time and ingenuity in

¹ *William Shakespeare*, 1930, vol. ii, Table I, p. 398, and Table VI, p. 402.

the present fashionable literary pastime of finding the missing lines in their so-called "short" plays, if they realise that such a generalisation as, "something about 3,000 lines seems to have been the normal length of a drama to which an Elizabethan audience was accustomed,"¹ finds no support in the facts. A simple example will show how much the so-called normal length of plays is at the mercy of the printer and publisher. In Mr. E. H. C. Oliphant's recently published work, *Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists*, the prose of *Twelfth Night* extends to 2,822 lines; in the Cambridge edition it is 1,485 lines, and in the Globe edition 1,752 lines. Had Fleay based his count on an edition of Shakespeare in which such a short play as *Twelfth Night* runs to 3,766 lines, his "normal" length of Elizabethan plays would have reached over 4,000 lines.

¹ J. D. Wilson, *The Hamlet Transcript* (1918), p. 38.

NEW POEMS BY RANDOLPH

By CYRUS L. DAY

Two manuscripts of unusual interest to students of early seventeenth-century verse, in particular the verse of Thomas Randolph, have recently been brought to my attention by the kindness of Professor Hyder E. Rollins. The first is in the Harvard College Library,¹ and contains, among some thirty-two Latin and English poems by Randolph, seven (possibly eight) which have not hitherto been ascribed to him or printed in the collected editions of his works. The second manuscript is in the Henry E. Huntington Library,² and contains ten poems by Randolph, four of which are identical with four of the new poems in the Harvard manuscript. I shall hereafter refer to these manuscripts as A and B respectively.

A (the Harvard manuscript) is the more important of the two for our present purposes. It is in an admirable state of preservation, measures $11\frac{1}{2}$ by $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and consists of eighty-one leaves, plus a preliminary leaf of thinner paper and a final blank leaf. In addition to the poems by Randolph, there are a hundred or more by Jonson, Herrick, Donne, Suckling, Carew, Fletcher, Herbert of Cherbury, Shirley, and other less conspicuous authors. The handwriting is bold and legible, and is the same throughout, except for the poem on fol. 81. On the verso of the preliminary leaf, and in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript, there is the following inscription:

Anthony St John
Ann: St John
1640 Bletso

Anthony St. John³ was the fourth son of Oliver, 4th Baron Bletsoe and 1st Earl of Bolingbroke. He was baptised May 10,

¹ Call number: MS. Eng. 626F*. Formerly Phillips MS. 13,187.

² MS. No. 172. Formerly Phillips MS. 10,110.

³ For information about St. John, see John Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Part I, 1927, iv, 5; Thomas Peile, *Biographical Register of Christ's College*, 1910, i, 442; *The Visitations of Bedfordshire*, ed. F. A. Blaydes, 1884, 194; and *Collins's Peerage of England*, 1812, vi, 747.

1618, at Melchbourne, Bedfordshire, and received his preliminary education at home. At the age of seventeen he was admitted fellow-commoner of Christ's College, Cambridge, May 4, 1636; and after graduating from the university he married Ann Kensham, of Tempsford, Bedfordshire, August 8, 1639. He was buried at Bletsoe, June 21, 1673.

That the manuscript is in the handwriting of Anthony St. John, there can be, I think, no doubt; but whether the date 1640 on the preliminary leaf refers to the time when he began the collection, or to the time when he finished it, or to neither, it is a more difficult matter to determine. The probability is that St. John transcribed the whole manuscript while he was at the university, and if this is so, the rather unduly large proportion of poems by the Cambridge poet, Randolph, is thus satisfactorily accounted for. Poets were accustomed in the seventeenth century to circulate their verses very freely among their friends and acquaintances, to be copied or passed on as the case might be; and though Randolph was dead when St. John entered the university, his memory was still green, and his poems were still in request. It is not surprising, therefore, that St. John's commonplace book should yield a number of lines (none of them of the first importance, frankly) which failed to find a place in Robert Randolph's edition of his brother's poems in 1638, or in subsequent editions.

Randolph's verses in A occupy fols. 41^v-60 and 64-64^v. Four of the English pieces which I here for the first time print as his are definitely ascribed to him, and the fifth, which is much in his style, is in the midst of the larger of the two groups of his undoubted poems. Of the Latin pieces, two are almost certainly Randolph's, and a third, already printed by Thorn-Drury from another manuscript,¹ may also be his. A list of the first lines of his poems as found in A follows. Ascriptions of authorship are reproduced in square brackets; the new poems by Randolph are marked with a double star; and page-references to the first edition of Randolph's poems² are indicated by the letter R:

- **1. Fol. 41^v. When gratefull Charles went to Paules hollowed shrine.
 ["translated by T. R:"]
 2. Fols. 41^v-44. How many of thy Captaines, Loue, complaine.
 R 15-21.

¹ *The Poems of Thomas Randolph*, ed. G. Thorn-Drury, 1929, 178-79.

² *Poems With The Muses Looking-Glasse: And Amyntas*, Oxford, 1638.

3. Fols. 44-44^v. Quid Templum abscindit? Quo luxque, diesque recessit? *The Poems of Thomas Randolph*, ed. G. Thorn-Drury, 1929, 178-79.
4. Fol. 44^v. What rends the Temple's vaile? where is daye gone. R 42.
5. Fols. 44^v-45^v. Ben doe not leaue the stage. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 71-73.
6. Fols. 45^v-46^v. I channc't sweet Lesbia's voice to heare. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 110-113.
- **7. Fol. 46^v. Vox Helenam, vultus Hecubam te Lesbia clamat.
- **8. Fol. 46^v. By thy lookes Hecuba, Helen by thy songe. ["Tho: R:"]
9. Fol. 46^v. Prima tibi perijt soboles Dilecta Maria. R 66-67.
10. Fol. 46^v. Thy first Birth Marie was vnto a Tombe. R 67.
- **11. Fol. 47. Inviditne tibi Tellus tua gaudia cælum.
- **12. Fol. 47. Why att thy Christ'ening did it rayne deare Prince.
13. Fol. 47. Lett Linus, and Amphions Lute. ["T: R:"] R 77-78.
14. Fol. 47. Say in a dancce, how shall wee goe. ["Tho: Rand:"] *The Muses Looking-Glasse*, 1638, I, iv.
15. Fols. 47^v-48. Fam'd Stymphal' I haue heard thy Birdes in flight. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 26-28.
16. Fols. 48-48^v. Joue sawe the Heavens form'd in a little glasse. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 28-29.
- **17. Fol. 48^v. When Jove sawe Archimedes world of glasse. ["Tho: R:"]
18. Fols. 48^v-49^v. I wonnder what should Madam Lesbia meane. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 24-26.
19. Fols. 49^v-50. Happie the man that all his daies hath spent. ["Tho: Rand:"] R. 32.
20. Fols. 50-51. Whoe in the world with buisie reason pries. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 29-31.
21. Fols. 51-52. Ver erat, et flores per apertum Libera Campum. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 7-10.
22. Fols. 52^v-54. The Spring was come, and all the fields growne fine. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 10-15.
23. Fol. 54^v. Ah miser, et nullo foelix in amore, Corinna. ["Tho: R:"] R 90.
24. Fol. 54^v-55. Ah wretch in thy Corinna's loue vnblest. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 91.
25. Fol. 55. Would you commence a Poet Sr. and bee. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 89.
26. Fols. 55-55^v. Fœlicem Anticyram, nullos ibi credo Poetas. ["Tho: Rand:"] R 89-90.
27. Fols. 55^v-58. Goe sordid Earth, and hope not to bewitch. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 1-7.
- **28. Fol. 58. Is thy poore Barke becalm'd, and forc'd to staye. ["Tho: Rand:"]
29. Fols. 58-59. My Lalage when I behold. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 73-75.

30. Fols. 59-60. Sweet Lydia take this Masque, and shrowde.
 ["Tho: R:"] R 123-124.
 31. Fol. 64. Why should wee not accuse thee of a Crime. *The Poems of Thomas Randolph*, ed. G. Thorn-Drury, 1929, 163.
 32. Fols. 64-64^v. 'Coy Cælia do'st thou see. R 76.

I have been unable to examine B (the Huntington manuscript) at first hand, but I am informed by a research assistant at the library that it measures 8 by 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches and consists of thirty-two leaves, that the edges are badly worn, and that it seems to date from the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Among the forty odd poems in the manuscript, the following are by Randolph:

1. Fols. 5^v-6^v. I chanc'd sweete Lesbia's voyce to heare. R 110-113.
- **2. Fol. 6^v. Vox Helenam, vultus Hecubam te Lesbia clamat.
- **3. Fol. 6^v. By thy lookes Hecuba, Helen by thy song. ["Tho: Randoiph."] R 15-21.
4. Fols. 10^v-14. How many of thy captives Love complayne. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 15-21.
5. Fol. 14. Lett Linus and Amphions lute. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 77-78.
6. Fols. 14-14^v. Say in a dance, how shall wee goe. ["Tho: Randoiph."] *The Muses Looking-Glasse*, 1638, i, iv.
7. Fol. 14^v. Jove, sawe the Heavens form'd in a little glasse. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 28-29.
- **8. Fols. 14^v-15. When Jove sawe Archimedes world of glasse. ["Tho: Randoiph."] R 1-7.
9. Fols. 22-24^v. Goe sordid earth and hope not to bewitch. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 1-7.
- **10. Fol. 24^v. Is thy poore Barke becalm'd? and forc'd to stay. ["Tho: Randolph."] R 1-7.

Both manuscripts are interesting for reasons other than that they contain new poems by Randolph. Herrick, for example, is well represented in A; and since this manuscript dates from about a decade earlier than the publication of Herrick's poems in 1648, the variant readings, which are numerous, are of especial authority. It is almost certain, furthermore, that both A and B were copied directly from a single common source, for (1) approximately two-thirds of the poems in B are to be found also in A; and (2) both A and B show a very large number of identical variant readings.

(1) With regard to the similarity in the contents of the two manuscripts, it may be sufficient to observe that the last fifteen poems in B (fols. 22-32) appear also in A (fols. 55^v-78), and in precisely the same order except for the fact that the fourth poem of

this group in B is the sixth in A. Seven of these fifteen poems I have failed to identify, but the other eight are the work of Randolph, Jonson, Fletcher, and "James Waters." It is beyond credence that such diverse poems can have been assembled in the same order coincidentally by two different collectors, and the only tenable hypotheses, therefore, are either that one manuscript was copied from the other, or that both were copied from a third manuscript.

(2) The first of these hypotheses seems the more plausible on the surface, but the second is in fact the correct one. In both manuscripts there are a large number of variants with respect to the first and only authoritative edition of Randolph's poems. These variants are of several kinds—a difference in the form of a word or in the word itself; the omission of a word, or of a line or lines; a change in the order of a series of words or lines. Variants such as these are numerous, as I have said, and striking; but their evidence is ambiguous, and supports equally well the hypothesis of a single source or that of the indebtedness of one manuscript to the other. There are a few variants in both A and B, however, not common to each other; and in such cases the reading of the *Poems*, 1638, nearly always agrees with the reading of the manuscript in which the variant does not occur. Each scribe, in other words, made an occasional error in copying; but both scribes were hardly likely to err at the same point unless, as seems possible in three or four cases, the original manuscript was defective or obscure. But the assembly of variant readings is hardly germane to the present study, and I therefore leave the pleasure and credit of such an undertaking to the next editor of Thomas Randolph's poetry.

The first poem by Randolph in A is a translation of six Latin lines ascribed in the manuscript to John Hoskins (1566-1638), a renowned wit who was created serjeant-at-law in 1623. Anthony Wood possessed a collection of epigrams and epitaphs by Hoskins, but his scattered Latin verses have never been brought together and published.

[Fol. 41] Dum Rex Paulinas accessit gratus ad aras
Emicuit medio Lucida stella die.

Dic diuina mihi tractans ænigmata præco
Hæc oriens nobis quid sibi stella velit

[Fol. 41^v] Magnus in occiduo Princeps modo nascitur orbe
Crasque sub Eclipsin regna Orientis erunt
Ser: Hosk:

When gratefull Charles went to Paules hollowed shrine
 A Lucid starre ev'n att high Noone did shine
 Sampsons ænigma (Preist) thou did'st not misse
 And therefore riddle mee, riddle mee what's this
 A Western starre being borne gloriously bright
 To morrowe will eclipse the Easterne light
 translated by T. R.

The allusion in these verses is to the birth of a son, afterwards Charles II, to the king and queen on May 29, 1630. At midday following this auspicious event a star¹ was seen, so tradition has it, above St. James's Palace; and in the afternoon the king rode to St. Paul's Cathedral to offer thanks for the queen's safe deliverance and the birth of an heir to the throne. A volume of gratulatory poems, *Britanniæ Natalis*, was shortly published at Oxford to express the joy of the university, but the plague was then raging at Cambridge, the academic body was dispersed, and no corresponding volume was issued. Randolph, however, wrote at least two brief poems upon the event,² and a third, as we shall see, upon the occasion of the prince's baptism.

Another translation of Hoskins's poem is preserved in David Lloyd's *Eikon Basilike*, 1660,³ and attributed to John Selden. Hoskins and Selden are said to have been friends, and although Lloyd does not describe the latter's verses as a translation, it is clear that they are based on the same Latin lines that were used by Randolph:

*When to Pauls cross the grateful King drew near,
 A shining Star did in the heavens appear.
 Thou that consult'st with divine mysteries,
 Tell me what this bright Comet signifies?
 Now is there born a valiant Prince i' th' West,
 That shall eclyps the Kingdoms of the East.*

Randolph's poem on the deformed Lesbia and her incomparably sweet voice is followed in A by two distichs, one in Latin and one in English, on the same subject.

[Fol. 46^v]

In Eandem Dystichon

Vox Helenam, vultus Hecubam te Lesbia clamat
 Vox (Mihi namque places) Incipe: Forma tace.

¹ Thomas Fuller (*The History Of The Worthies Of England*, 1662, sig. Hhh) confesses that the star was really nothing more nor less than the planet Venus, and that two days later there was an eclipse of the sun, presaging misfortune.

² In addition to his translation from Hoskins, see also his Latin and English lines *In Natalem Augustissimi Principis Caroli* in his *Poems*, 1638, 66-67.

³ P. 10.

Englished

By thy lookes Hecuba, Helen by thy songe
 Lett thy voice speake ; Bidd thy Face hold her tongue
 Tho: R:

It seems probable, though proof is lacking, that both the Latin and English versions of this distich are by Randolph, but of course the signature, strictly speaking, applies only to the English version. Both versions are included in B (fol. 6^v).

The following Latin and English lines on the baptism of the young Prince Charles on June 27, 1630, have already been mentioned. They are not ascribed to Randolph in the manuscript, but as I have pointed out, they are included with the rest of his poems in A, and they are clearly intended to be regarded as his. I have been unable to find any other allusion to its having rained on the day of Charles's baptism.

[Fol. 47] In Diem Baptizationis Principis Caroli.
 Inviditne tibi Tellus tua gaudia cælum
 Quod Baptizato Principe det Lachrymas
 Noluit hoc nostrosque suosque vt narret amores
 Baptizare etiam Terra, dat Imber aquas

Englished

Why att thy Christ'ening did it rayne deare Prince
 Would Heav'n in teares Earths publique ioye convince
 It could not meane it. To expresse our Glee
 Earth was baptiz'd, and Heav'n the Font would bee

The next new piece in A is a translation from the Latin of Claudian. Another translation by Randolph ¹ of the same poem has been included in all the collected editions of his works and represents a more skilful treatment of Claudian's theme. The text in B (fols. 14^v-15) shows no significant variants.

[Fol. 48^v] When Jove sawe Archimedes world of glasse
 Wherein each Orbe, each Spheare, each motion was
 His wisdoms hee condemnes, that would impart
 To such a Brittle mettle soe much Art.
 Joue doe not that in Archimedes blame
 Which fault in thy Creation is the same
 The matter of the Greater world all see
 Like his, is nothing but Fragillitie.
 Tho: R:

¹ *Poems*, 1638, 28-29.

Finally I print for the first time the following lines upon the fickleness of fortune. In B (fol. 24^v) the word "upp" is inserted in line 2 after "fetter'd."

[Fol. 58] De Moderatione Animi in vtraque fortuna.
Is thy poore Barke becalm'd, and forc'd to staye
A Prisoner fetter'd in a dead Sea?
Spight of the Threats, that Desperation brings
Bidd her att large spread forth her Canvas wings
In expectation of a happier gale
But when the winde blowes faire, contract her sayle
 Tho: Rand:

WILLIAM LATHUM, A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY POET

By L. BIRKETT MARSHALL

WILLIAM LATHUM, poet of the early part of the seventeenth century, has no place in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, although such a later poetaster as Valentine Oldys is given recognition. Lathum is scarcely known as the author of a small, rare book of verse, which appeared in the year 1634 and is mentioned by Lowndes, Hazlitt, and the *Bibliotheca Anglo-Poetica*. None of his work has even crept into the numerous anthologies of the period.

Of his life nothing is known. The chief poem of the volume is an elegy in honour of "Nathaniel Weld, Master of Arts in Emanuel Colledge in Cambridge." The latter entered Emanuel as a scholar in the Lent Term, 1623/4, took his B.A. degree in 1627/1628, and his M.A. degree in 1631. In the book of the University of Cambridge Matriculations and Degrees (1544-1659), a certain William Lathum is said to have entered Emanuel College as a pensioner about the year 1592. This may be the author of the volume of verses, although he would appear to be too old, perhaps, for the deep friendship which evidently existed between Nicholas Weld and the writer of the Elegy. Portions of the other verses in the volume, however, would seem to indicate that the writer was not a very young man. It is possible that William Lathum was Weld's guardian.

The volume is entitled :

Phyala Lachrymarum, or a Few Friendly Teares, shed over the dead Body of M^r Nathaniel Weld M^r of Arts of *Emanuel Colledge in Cambridge* ; who in the short journey of his life, died betweene the five and sixe and twentieth yeare of his youth, 1633. Together with sundry choyce Meditations of Mortalitie.

Dignus longiore vita nisi quod vita meliore dignus.

This volume was printed at London by R. Y.,¹ for a certain

¹ "R. Y." was almost certainly Robert Young, who printed and published books from 1625 to 1640. George Lathum or Latham published from 1620-1658. There is no entry of this book in the Registers of the Stationers' Company.

George Lathum, at the signe of the Bishop's Head in Paul's Church-yard, and is dedicated by Lathum, who signs his name in full, to the Right Honourable Thomas Lord Bruce, Earl of Elgin.

The longest poem in the volume, the "Elegy," is interesting for at least two reasons. Firstly, many portions of it are good poetry, in which the author reveals a distinct ability in the use of well-sounding proper names and the Elizabethan gift of beautiful alliteration. Secondly, it deserves attention as an Elegy, which celebrated the death of a Cambridge scholar, written possibly by another Cambridge man, and which appeared only four years before the writing of *Lycidas*. Weld died the year after Milton gained his M.A. degree at Christ's College, and was possibly known to him. There are few verbal reminiscences in *Lycidas* of this poem, no passages of deep resemblance, but it is almost certain that Milton read the Elegy.

The latter was the outcome of a sincere friendship, sincerer perhaps than Milton's would appear to have been. Lathum writes in his dedication :

His true love and affection to mee, hath perswaded mee to proclaime my grieffe in this manner, for the losse of so worthy a deare friend, to the world.

And the opening lines of a short prefatory poem "*Flete meos casus*," although containing an absurd "conceit," are at once forcefully sincere and poetically alliterative :

How can I choose but dolefully complaine
Unto each gentle eare, and tender minde
The sorrie accident, that doth constraîne
My heart to scald with sighs of strangled wind. . . .

Lathum strikes a note of real poetry, when, in the approved fashion of the times, he demands precious spices for the coffin of his friend :

Bring some of those *Arabian* merchandise,
Sweete Aromatick Gummes, and pretious spice,
Pure Frankincense, and pounded Cynamom
Nutmegs, with Cloves, and Mace, and Saffron some,
Add Storax-Calamite, and Bengewine,
And pretious Spicknard unto these conjoyne,
Aloes, with Myrrhe, and Cassia-Fistula,
The fragrant fuell, and the spicie spray
Whereof that bird (of selfe dusts, selfe worme) bred
Doth build her neast to serve for her death-bed,
Which flaming round about her, she sits downe,
And with sweet martyrdome her selfe doth crowne. . . .

And for flowers to deck the hearse :

Now come with flowers, not flowers by them worne
Who losse of love do suffer (all forlorne :)
Bring here therefore no caytive Columbines,
Flowers of ill omen, and unhappy signes ;
No gaudie Tulips here admitted be,
(Emblemes of false (faire-fained) sanctitie,)
Whose worth all outward is in shew alone,
But inward sent hath not, ne vertue none. . . .

Instead of these, bring store of fragrant flowers,
By faithfull friends, and pious paramours. . . .
Bring bashfull Pinks in which is to discry
Sweet Embleme of faire-maiden-moderatie ;
Which (though of flowers least almost) the field
For sweetnesse, to the greatest need not yeeld.

Then Gilliflowers, and sparkling Sops in wine,
With Rosemary and senting Eglantine,
Whose leaves (with prickles fenc'd) teach sweetest gains
Is that, that's conquered with the hardest paines.

Next Hyacinths, and black-fac'd Violets,
In which (me seems) the God of Nature sets
The world to schoole, not ever to esteeme
Ought at first sight, as it doth outward seeme ;

The whole passage on the flowers is long, but much of it is good enough quality for most anthologies of seventeenth-century verse. Here and there the charm of an epithet catches the eye :

The *country* Primrose, and all sorts of Lillies,

or

And doth the number of the Saints increase
In *eviternall* peace. . . .

Occasionally a couplet reveals something that Milton was soon to do much better :

Embalme it over all, and strew his hearse
With the sweet fragrant odours of your verse :

The end of the passage is quite as good as the opening :

Now forward set, in order, two and two,
And to the Temple doe before him goe,
Some with long Rosemary-branches in your hands,
Dangling with blacke, and ashie-pale Ribbands ;
And some againe with both your handfulls come
Of sav'ry Dyll, and senting Marjorum,
And that Thessalian herbe, whence busie bees
Suck hunny. . . .

And all the way with slips of wormwood dresse
In signe of this dayes bitter heavinesse.

Clean-purging Isop bring, and Germander,
With Cotton, and her sister Lavander ;
Bring Balme, that quickly heales any green wound ;
And sage that all the vitall parts keeps sound ;

And Camomel, (how ever meane and base)
 The Embleme of true constancie and grace ;
 And doth against all scornfull feete oppose,
 And much more sweet, for thy', and thicker growes.
 And Sallet-budded Broom, wholesome and good
 To purge, and eeke, the waterish-wasted blood.
 Bring Strawberry, Primrose, Plantan leaves, Toutsain,
 And all what ever Simples, soveraigne
 For mans reliefe, (for in, or outward cure)
 Bring some of all, leave none behinde, be sure :
 Bring Saint *Johns* Wort, whose vertuous oyle may dare
 (For skill in healing) with selfe Balme compare,
 And Lungwort.

The second part of the volume contains the "sundry choyce Meditations of Mortalitie" mentioned in the title. These gentle verses, often very poetic, and full of late-Elizabethan and Jacobean deliberations upon death and the soul of man, have a special title-page :

Meditationes quaedam De Amicitia, de Vitae Fragilitate, de Morte, et de Anima. Londoni. Excudebat R.Y. impensis G. Lathum 1634.

Many of them, like the poems of Thomas Beedome and numerous other forgotten poets of the period, which I am collecting, are well worthy of at least anthological fame. There are twenty-one of them in all.

William Lathum was an Italian scholar, as well as a Classical one, and the Meditations are based upon certain Italian proverbs, as he himself says in the dedicatory address before his Elegy.

The conclusions which I have fetcht out of these *Italian* proverbiall maxims, I must confesse are but as the first faint drops which Chymists are wont to extract out of pretious Simples and Mineralls, through an earthen Limbecke, or a Bolts-head, of brittle glasse (at the best). . . .

The best and easiest way of proving the value of a poet is to quote his verses at length. One of the finest of these Meditations is an address by the poet to his soul, entitled, if it may be so put, "Proso-popeia Corporis Animae valedicturi : Adios a rivederci."

My lovely frend, that long hast been content
 To dwell with mee in my poore Tenement,
 Whose bulke and all the stuffe, both warp and woofe,
 Is all of clay, the floor and the roofe :
 Though yet thou ne're foundst fault ; ne didst upbraid
 This homely hermitage, so meanly made ;
 O mine owne darling, my deere daintie one,
 And wilt thou now indeed from mee be gone ?
 Ah, for thou seest all running to decay
 The thatchie covering's now nigh falne away :

The windows, which give light to every roome,
 Broken, and dimme, and mistie beene become,
 The Mill-house, and selfe Miller's out of frame,
 My Kitchin smoakes, my Larder is too blame,
 And from the Studds each where the Lome doth shrink,
 And the breeme cold blowes in at every chinke.
 The brases and supporters of my house
 Tremble, and waxen wondrous ruinous.

So that all bee it grieve mee to the heart,
 To thinke that thou and I (old friends) must part;
 Yet, sith my Cabban's all out of repaire,
 (Darling) farewell, goe sojourne now else where,
 In some cleane place, untill that premier Main
 That built mee first, rebuild mee up againe,
 All of the selfe same stuffe, but with such art,
 So polisht, and imbellisht every part,
 That it shall ne're be out of Kulture more:
 Then shalt thou come againe, as heretofore,
 And dwell with mee for ever and for aye:
 (So God us both to blesse untill that happie day.)

The poem to the Happy man, which Lathum calls "Felice chi puo," in spite of the commonplace theme, has a definite charm of expression, and might well find its position beside Pope's poem on the same subject.

Blest mote hee ever bee, who ever can
 Compose the joyes, and sorrows of his mind,
 Chuse truth from error, flow'r from the bran;
 Willing obey Gods sacred Lawes in kinde;
 Decline the vice, to which hee's most inclin'd;
 Richly contented bee, what ere God send;
 Slight injuries, as chaffe before the winde,
 Finde a fit wife, and faithfull bosome friend:
 Who some, nay one, but all these things who can,
 Is sure a threefold-blessed, tenfold-happy man.

Another short poem on the loss of a friend, inspired probably by the same loss as the Elegy, is "Perdre un Amico fidele è sopra o'gni dolore."

Of all the cares, and humane miserie,
 Which from the Cradle to the Beere attend,
 Is none of all can touch a man more nigh,
 Than the hard losse of true approved frend;
 To whom thy fortune doth not thee commend:
 But rich or poore, thy winter, and thy spring,
 Hee all alike doth tender to the end.
 Each bird, while summer lasts, will sweetly sing;
 But constant Red-brest pipes his chearefull notes
 When frost, and storms dams th'others glozing throats.

Two sonnets which deserve notice are not Shakespearian in technique.¹ The first is on the theme that however wretched and

¹ Nor are they Petrarchan. They appear to be entirely experimental and look forward to some nineteenth-century sonnets.

disappointed we are we should take courage from seeing others yet more miserably wretched than ourselves and be thankful that we are not in a worse state ourselves. The second is akin to a thought which pervades the *Religio Medici*, namely, that each day we should remember how near sleep and death are. The former is entitled, "Monocchio, non e misero nel presenza del cieco."

When I consult the sacred Histories,
And other Stories of inferior sort,
And finde therein, what under mysteries,
And plainly what they of mans life report,
Oft in the prime, oft suddenly cut short,
And every day sad samples thereof see,
Mee seemes they secretly do mee exhort
To fit my selfe, the very next to be,
And meekly more my misery to beare,
Compar'd with others (greater in degree)
As hee, whose one eye perled is, and bleare,
Seemes blest to him, who can at all not see.
So they, who others greater griefe and mone,
Can call to minde, gaine strength to beare their owne.

The latter is "Il sonno e una morte vivente":

When I doe weigh how little differing
Life is from death, how little or nought at all
Death is from sleepe, when neere so small a thing
Can make them all be transubstantiall,
Oh what amazement on my minde doth fall!
And I do wonder how I sleepe or wake,
Sith unto death, in nature they so neere partake.
And in the morning after quiet sleepe,
When I consider to how weak a guard
My pretious life I did commit to keepe,
Being for death a thing not very hard
To seize his brothers right, sith if compar'd,
Sleep's but a breathing death, death breathlesse sleep,
I feele a tingling chilnesse over all my bones to creepe.

In a poem describing the valiant man, one who truly finds happiness on this earth, Latham reveals again the quiet, steadfast, patient philosophy, which he firmly believed in for combatting the sorrows of this world. He says, like the stoic:

Come good? why well, and good: come bad? why well:
So 'gainst all paines, his patience is his spell:

The greatest are those who have the nature

To welcome faire and foule in selfe same kinde.

Life, in another poem, he likens to a tennis game, played in the World, the tennis-court. The simile may at first appear an ordinary seventeenth-century conceit, but in the poem it is forceful enough.

All manner chance, are Rackets, wherewithall
 They bandie men like balls, from wall to wall :
 Some over Lyne, to honour and great place ;
 Some under Lyne, to infame and disgrace ;
 Some with a cutting stroke, they nimble send
 Into the hazzard placed at the end ;
 Resembling well the rest which all they have,
 Whom death hath seiz'd, and placed in their grave :
 Some o're the wall they bandie quite away,
 Who never more are seene to come in play :
 Which intimates, that even the very best
 Are soone forgot of all, if once deceast.

So, (whether silke-quilt ball it bee, or whether
 Made of course cloth, or of most homely lether ;)
 They all alike are banded to and fro,
 And all at last to selfe same end do goe,
 Where is no difference, or strife for place :
 No odds betweene a Trype-wife and your Grace :
 The penny-counter's every whit as good,
 As that, which in the place of thousands stood.
 When once the Audit's full cast up, and made
 The learned Arts, well as the manuall Trade :
 The Prisoner and the Judge upon the Bench :
 The pampered Lady, and the Kitchin-wench :
 The noble Lord, or, Counsaillor of State,
 The botchy-Lazer, begging at the gate,
 Like Shrubs, and Cedars mingled ashes, lye
 Without distinction, when they once do dye.
 Ah for unpartiall death, and th'homely grave
 Looke equall on the free man, and the slave. . . .

Lathum never gets away from his age in his ideas. The theme of the last paragraph in the above quotation is commonplace in seventeenth-century verse. It is, for example, Sir John Beaumont's

Alas ! whate'er their wealth, their wit, their worth,
 Such is the end of all the Sons of Earth.

But he is equally with his age in facility of poetic expression. He has many good lines, and a number of passages of true poetic worth. In his highest flights he is worthy of some recognition.

SOME LANDOR WAIFS

By M. F. ASHLEY-MONTAGU

WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR died on September 17, 1864, in his eighty-ninth year. Less than five years later, in 1869, appeared John Forster's *Biography* of "the unsubduable old Roman," as Carlyle called Landor. Forster was the friend and literary executor of Landor, and in the latter capacity had access to all the available papers connected with him. These he used for the *Biography* and *The Life and Works*, 1876, publishing much new poetry and prose.

Since that time, however, with the exception of numerous letters, and shorter pieces of poetry and prose, unearthed mainly by the indefatigable labours of Mr. Stephen Wheeler,¹ and some pieces privately printed for Mr. T. J. Wise,² little that is new has come to light.

In the June issue of *The Nineteenth Century*, 1930, I published three new *Imaginary Conversations* by Walter Savage Landor, which I had had the great good fortune to discover among some papers in the possession of Landor's granddaughter, Madame Elfrida Mangioni-Landor of Florence.³ Soon after the publication of these three *Conversations* I acquired a number of Landor manuscripts, among which I found three further unpublished pieces, or more accurately, two unpublished pieces, and one variant form of a published work. This latter work is entitled *Pythagoras and a priest of Isis*, and from the condition of the manuscript, which consists of a single quarto sheet with two additional slips of script attached to its body, it would appear to be a first, much worked over, draft. From this Landor would have made a final draft for publication, and that he did so is evidenced by the piece of the same title published by Forster in the *Biography*, vol. ii, pp. 578-79, and of which, *inter alia*, Forster

¹ See *Letters and other Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, London, 1897; also *Letters of Walter Savage Landor, Private and Public*, London, 1899.

² See *A Landor Library*, London, 1928.

³ An additional *Imaginary Conversation* discovered in New York has since been published in the September issue of the *Nineteenth Century*, 1931.

writes, "I have now to add, of the last writings of this wonderful old man, five scenes or dialogues brought to me by Mr. Twisleton, from Landor, written at even a later date than any of the above, and printed below exactly as I received them, in accordance with his urgent desire" (*ibid.*). But the slips of script, and other significant emendations, attached to the body of the manuscript in my possession, would indicate that after Landor had sent his draft to Forster, he worked over the draft remaining with him in the endeavour, possibly, to improve a piece with which he was not altogether satisfied. Some of the lines which do not appear in the published piece are extremely fine, and I cannot help thinking that Landor intended them for publication; but of this the reader will have an opportunity of judging for himself. In printing the manuscript version I will give also, for purposes of comparison and because Forster's *Biography* is not easily accessible, the version as printed in the latter work.

From Forster's statements, above quoted, and from an examination of the handwriting of the manuscript, there can be little doubt that *Pythagoras and a priest of Isis* was written late in 1863 or early in 1864, and is thus to be ranked as one of the last pieces produced by Landor for publication.

The next piece, hitherto unpublished, like *Pythagoras and a priest of Isis*, is an *Imaginary Conversation* in verse, and is entitled, *Pisistratos and Solon*. The manuscript of this, too, would appear to be a first draft, having also two slips of script attached to its body. The theme of this *Conversation* is similar to the prose *Conversation* of the same name recently published by me in the *Nineteenth Century*, but it is neither as interesting nor as capable as the latter. The piece now published was, judging from the handwriting, written within the same period as *Pythagoras and a priest of Isis*, that is, between the years 1863 and 64.

The third unpublished piece is a fragment of a letter purporting to have been written by "Anaxagoras to Pericles," and doubtless was intended to have been incorporated in the text of *Pericles and Aspasia*. Letters clxiv and clxxxiii in the latter work are from Anaxagoras to Pericles, and the fragment here printed might well form part of the first of these letters. In itself this fragment forms a perfect example of the stately beauty of Landor's unequalled prose. From an examination of the handwriting I would incline to put the date of this piece at some time between 1850-55.

In the text which follows I have adhered strictly to the text of

the manuscripts, both the spelling and punctuation being Landor's; whatever else is not Landor's is explicitly noticed in the proper place.

PYTHAGORAS AND A PRIEST OF ISIS ¹

Pyth. . Thou hast inquired of me, and thou hast heard,
All I could tell thee of our deities
That ² patience hear me yet awhile, nor deem me rash
Who seek to know what may be known of yours.

Priest. . Willingly granted : hesitate no more.
Begin we then with those thou seest around,
Apes, dogs, and cats, think not we worship these,
But (what is holier even than worshipping)
An ever-mindful and strong gratitude
Urgeth us to look up to them.

O guest,
Now tell me what indweller of a town
But shares his substance not unwillingly,
With his protectress from invader mouse ;
What child but fondles her and is caresst ;
What aged dame but sees her likeness there
More strikingly than in her dearest child ?
Now to another of these images.
None are such friends as dogs, they never leave
The side of those who only stroke the head
And speak a kindly word to them.

Pyth. . "Tis true.

Priest. . Your elders long have placed amid the stars ³
The noblest of them, watchful yet from above.
We with our firm auxiliaries, these gods,
Stand around the throne and keep the crowd below.

Pyth. . Now may I ask of thee without offence
What good do apes to any, young or old,
What service render they, what fondness show ?
Thou smilest ; I rejoice to see that smile,
I wish all teachers could bear questioning,
So quietly, religious men the least.

¹ In the manuscript after "a priest," the words "in Egypt" have been deleted, and apparently "of Isis" were added later.

² "That" should obviously be "With," but so it stands in the manuscript.

³ From "Your elders . . ." to "Now may I ask . . ." is written upon the first of the slips of paper attached to the main sheet.

Priest. . . Pythagoras, they rightly call thee wise,
 Yet, like thy countrymen, thou knowest not
 Thy origin and theirs and all on earth,
 Some of you think, nor quite absurdly so,
 That, when the deluge drown'd all creatures else,
 One only woman was there left alive,
 And she took up two stones and cast behind
 Her back those two ; whence man and woman sprang.
 Scraps of the stone seem sticking to the heart
 Of those primordial ones.

We priests of Isis
 Acknowledge duly our progenitor
 Whose moral features still remain unchanged
 In many, thro' all times.

Did ever Ape
 (As kindred nations have been doing since)
 Tear limb from limb his brother, grin to see
 His native bush and his blue babes enwrap
 In flames about the crib for windingsheet ?
 There live in other lands, from ours remote,
 The intolerant and ferocious who insist
 That all shall worship what themselves indite.
 We never urge this stiff conformity.¹
 Forms ever present are our monitors,
 Nor want they flesh and blood, nor shed they any
 No creed is it of ours that Gods descend
 In human shape and substance to beget
 Another God who leaves no trace behind,
 No likeness of himself, no kept command.
 Ours teach us silently ; let ev'ry man
 Leave each man his choice, [whether] ² he incline
 To worship sculptured block or pictured plank.
 But only let him rise from his knees,
 Abstain from sprinkling blood around the base
 Nor drive his kindred from parental door.

I will now give the work as printed in Forster's *Biography*.

¹ After " . . . conformity," follow the lines :

Are there no tares in every field of wheat ?
 We root them from our own, we trample not
 Upon our neighbour's ; he who weeds that well
 May there find work enough before he sleep.
 Forms ever present are our monitors
 And teach us silently, for never god
 Spake upon earth or took a human shape.
 A fablebook is the first book we give
 To children, and the last we read to men.

Over this is pasted the second slip on which are written the lines from " Forms ever present . . ." to " . . . parental door."

² My own reading. The word is quite illegible in the manuscript.

PYTHAGORAS AND A PRIEST OF ISIS

Pythagoras. Thou hast inquired of me, and thou hast heard
 All I could tell thee of our Deities ;
 With patience bear me yet awhile, nor deem me
 Irreverent, if I ask to know of yours
 Which are around me on these sacred walls.

Priest. Willingly granted ; hesitate no more ;
 Speak.

Pythagoras. Yonder is an ape, and there a dog,
 And there a cat.

Priest. Think not we worship these,
 But, what is holier even than worshipping,
 Gratitude, mindful thro' obscuring years,
 Urgeth us to look up to them.

O guest !
 Now tell me what indweller of a town
 But shares his substance, nor unwillingly,
 With his protectress from invader mouse ;
 What child but fondles her and is caresst ;
 What aged dame but sees her likeness there
 More strikingly than in her dearest child ?

Now to another of these images.
 None are such friends as dogs ; they never leave
 The side of those who only stroke the head
 Or speak a kindly word to them.

Pythagoras. 'Tis true.
 But may I ask of thee without offence,
 What good do apes to any, young or old,
 What service render they, what fondness show ?
 Thou smilest ; I rejoice to see that smile.
 I wish all teachers could bear questioning
 So quietly. Religious men bear least.

Priest. Pythagoras, they rightly call thee wise,
 Yet, like thy countrymen, thou knowest not
 Thy origin and theirs, and all on earth.
 Some of you think, nor quite absurdly so,
 That, when the deluge drown'd all creatures else,
 One only woman was there left alive,
 And she took up two stones and cast behind
 Her back those two, whence men and women sprang.
 Scraps of the stone seem clinging to the heart
 Of that primordial pair.

We priests of Isis
 Acknowledge duly our progenitor,
 Whose moral features still remain unchanged
 In many, thro' all times.

Did ever ape,
 As kindred nations have been doing since,
 Tear limb from limb the brother, grin to see
 His native bush and his blue babes enwrap
 In flames about the crib for winding-sheet ?
 There live in other lands, from ours remote,
 The intolerant and ferocious who insist
 That all shall worship what themselves indite ;
 We never urge this stiff conformity.
 Forms ever present are our monitors,
 Nor need they flesh and blood, nor spill they any.
 We leave each man his choice, the pictured plank
 Or hammer'd block, nor quarrel over ours.

PISISTRATOS AND SOLON

- Pisist. . O Solon, heartily do I rejoice
 To find thee in our city once again.
 Solon. . Say not *our* city *now* ; Pisistratos,
 'Tis thine, not mine.
 Pisist. . All Attic citizens may claim it.
 Solon. . All *could* claim it, all alike.
 How few now dare !
 Pisist. . No law I abrogate
 Devised by thee, by thee promulgated.
 Solon. . These were enow, and more than were obey'd :
 Others thou addest to support thy power.
 Pisist. . All things want changes ; laws want supplements ;
 They must be fitted to the yearly growth
 Of flourishing and rising commonwealths
 As vestures are to children's and adults.
 Solon. . To commonwealths ! hast thou left commonwealth
 Or aught in common here but servitude ?
 Pisist. . Much, Solon, what I found I have enlarged,
 Liberal arts and sciences and fanes
 More stately, more adorn'd, and porticoes
 More spacious and more shelter'd, wider streets
 And smoother pavements, and such theatres
 As Gods delight in with the Muses round.
 Go into any of our shadier walks,
 Where there is silence and few feet intrude,
 And thou wilt find some studious youth bent o'er
 Our Homer ; let me dare to call him *ours*,
 For I have been combining all the parts
 By thee brought out of Crete.
 Solon. . Thy best employ.
 Homer might make thee listen to the boys
 Upon the benches, when they read aloud
 What said Sarpedon to another prince.

" Why are we, Glaucos, honor'd above all
 The rest about us in the Lycian plain ? "
 Odysseus is not praised for craftiness,
 But for grave counsel and endurance hard.
 Heroes are less of heroes by their strength
 Than their forbearance, it far less requires
 To master others than unruly self.

Pisist. . I listen, and will ponder well thy words.

ANAXAGORAS TO PERICLES

It is part of your wisdom, O Pericles, to abstain so totally, as you tell me you do, from all disquisitions on theology. The boys who assemble in the garden of Academos, which they call the *grove*, are kept in order at present by some amusing dialecticians, who listen attentively to perplexing discourse. But there is danger, methinks, lest the graver religionists, at some time not distant, may inter-rupt them violently, not perhaps in my time, nor in yours, who are younger. It is better to be idle than to run after what never can be reacht. We take the gods as we find them, and there we leave them. Morals are not to be improved by the tongue turning them over. Our conscience teaches them and is their best interpreter. There exist in the farther east philosophers more sagacious than the wisest of ours, Democritos, never heard of them. Zoroaster may have caught a glimpse of them, or may not ; however this be, he was better engaged in tracing the courses of the stars than in following the vagaries of such children as run after their master thro' the bewildering thickets in the grove of Academos. Herodotos, the most delightful and the most instructive of writers squandered away none of his time in attempting to solve the riddles of a Sphynx. There are many things of utility yet undiscovered which a studious and calm investigation may disclose.

MSS. BODLEY 340 AND 342: ÆLFRIC'S
CATHOLIC HOMILIES¹

By KENNETH SISAM

IV

In my previous article I digressed so far on the text of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* that I must go a little farther, premising that the problem is one for an editor with full collations, and that the materials I can bring to it are no more than enough to make a beginning.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MS. Gg. 3.28

Wanley's full description (*Catalogue*, p. 153) directed Thorpe to this codex as the best single source of the *Catholic Homilies*. No other manuscript contains the Latin and English prefaces, or has the text of both the volumes that these prefaces describe. We have seen, too, that in a Latin note on the special copy for Æthelweard and on the uselessness of a table of contents, it preserves Ælfric's direction to the scribes who prepared the early copies of his First Series.²

Thorpe prints the bulk of the contents in their order, which is : (a) *Catholic Homilies*, First Series ;³ (b) The Second Series,³ with the author's closing prayer (Thorpe, ii, 594) ; (c) Ælfric's *de Temporibus Anni* (ff. 255a-261b, not printed by Thorpe), with a heading which may be rendered : "Hereafter follows a little piece on the Times of the Year, which is not accounted a sermon, but is rather to be read by anybody whom it pleases." It begins "I purpose also, if I may venture to do so, to collect briefly some

¹ Continued from *R.E.S.* vii, 7-22 January 1931.

² *R.E.S.* vii, pp. 12 ff.

³ *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. B. Thorpe, Ælfric Society, 2 vols. 1844-1846. Some leaves have been lost, and Thorpe fills the gaps from MS. Royal 7. C. XII for the First Series and from our Bodley MSS. for the Second. He does not mention that the last leaf of the First Series is missing, with the words following *gemænelic* (p. 618 of the print near the foot) and presumably a colophon. In his Preface (p. vii, note) he explains that long passages translated from the Gospels have been abridged. His paragraphing has generally no manuscript authority. His text is reasonably accurate in matters affecting the sense, but minor words are sometimes carelessly treated. An editor would do well to begin by collating it on the manuscript.

information from the book that Bede made . . .";¹ (d) Translations of the Paternoster, Creeds, and some short prayers (Thorpe, ii, 596-601); (e) A Lenten sermon *De Penitentia* (Thorpe, ii, 602-8), proved to be Ælfric's by the reference (p. 604) to his previous sermons on the Paternoster (i, xix) and the Creed (i, xx); (f) A few lines on abstinence in Lent (Thorpe, ii, 608) which are closely connected with the preceding sermon; (g) Ælfric's *Epistola de Canonibus* (not in Thorpe's edition), a pastoral letter prepared for the third Bishop Wulfsig of Sherborne. It is imperfect at the end (f. 266b), for the last two leaves have been lost.²

There is precise evidence that all these works are Ælfric's, except for the Creeds and Prayers, which may safely be assigned to him on grounds of style and of aptitude to the purpose of the whole collection. That purpose was to supply ordinary priests, in clear English, with the religious instruction necessary for their congregations, together with some related writings for the guidance of the priests themselves—the *De Temporibus* to deepen their knowledge of matters which are frequently touched upon in the *Homilies*, the Pastoral Letter to show them their duties. Unity of aim, and the exclusion of works by other authors,³ mark the contents of MS. Gg. 3.28 as a compilation made under Ælfric's own direction.

But probably none of the items (c)-(g) went out with the *Catholic Homilies* as they were submitted to Archbishop Sigeric: all follow the prayer with which Ælfric closed the work; the prefaces to the *Homilies*, which are almost pedantically minute, give no hint of them; and the first piece, *De Temporibus*, is copied separately, beside matter relating to Sigeric, in the contemporary miscellany MS. Tiberius B.V.,⁴ which would be natural enough if it were issued

¹ Printed from this MS. by K. W. Bouterwek, *Screadunga*, 1858, pp. 23 ff., and with full collations by O. Cockayne, *Leechdoms*, iii, 231 ff.

² The latest edition is by B. Fehr, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics* (Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa IX), Hamburg, 1914, pp. 1 ff.

³ Ælfric took pains to segregate his own writings. In the prayer at the end of the *Catholic Homilies*, he begs other translators or expounders of the Gospels to keep their work apart from his own. Again, at the end of the Preface to the *Lives of Saints*, he asks that his work should be copied without interpolations. There is thus a presumption that manuscripts prepared under his direction do not include the works of others; and conversely that collections in which his works are mingled with alien matter have not his authority.

⁴ This is supported by indications that Ælfric retouched the version in Tiberius B.V. at beginning and end for the separate issue. In MS. Gg. 3.28 it begins "Ic wolde eac, gyf ic dorste, *gadrian* . . . of ðære bec þe Beda . . . gesette and *gegaderode* . . .". Tiberius B.V. has *pluccian* "excerpt" (cf. Thorpe, i, p. 212, foot), which seems to be an improvement made because *gegaderode* followed so closely. Cf. p. 57n. 1 below.

as a separate tract, but not so likely if it were known to be a part of the book of *Catholic Homilies*. Now there is evidence elsewhere¹ that when Ælfric was moved by one of his correspondents to write a new short piece, he kept a copy by having it entered at the end of a suitable codex. The *De Temporibus*, as its preamble shows, he placed at the end of a copy of the *Catholic Homilies*. Probably the items (d)-(g) were added to the same "official" volume in their chronological order by his directions.

There is no reason to think that MS. Gg. 3.28 is itself that authoritative copy. It is not a codex built up quire by quire, or item by item, as matter became available, but is written from beginning to end in one main hand,² on a uniform plan, and with a strict economy of vellum. A new item usually follows on in the same quire, the same page, and sometimes even in the same line. Only the Second Series begins a new right-hand page, but apparently it is the second leaf of a quire, so that the book was not designed to be bound in two volumes. It is, then, a copy, direct or indirect, of a collection built up under Ælfric's instructions; and is thus very near the fountain-head.

Where it was written is not known. The signature of Leonard Pilkington³ and a press-mark at the top of the first page indicate that it came to Cambridge from Durham. The main hand, which is strongly influenced in duct by the Caroline minuscule, would normally be assigned to the last years of the tenth or the first years of the eleventh century. Any closer dating must depend on the contents themselves, and particularly on the last item, the Pastoral Letter for Bishop Wulfsgie, which, apart from its order in the codex, is pretty certainly the latest in date of composition. The extreme limits of Wulfsgie's bishopric are 992-1002. Since Dietrich wrote, this Letter has usually been assigned to 998, or later, because in that year Wulfsgie established monks at Sherborne in place of canons. But there is no necessary connection between the Letter and this reform. The unusual asperity of Ælfric's preface would best be

¹ See below, p. 60, (d).

² There is no change of hand at the beginning of the Second Series. A rounder, more upright hand, with distinct letter forms, appears in short passages here and there, e.g. ff. 225a, 226b, 240b-241b. I take this to be the hand of the miniator; cf. the minuscule headings of *De Temporibus* at f. 261b. The initial capitals throughout the book are simple, and yet unusual enough to deserve attention; the broader strokes are outlined in brown-black ink and filled with a zig-zag pattern in bright red.

³ See *D.N.B.* The mark is reproduced in New Palæographical Society, pl. 147, 4a.

accounted for if he still felt freshly the contrast between Æthelwold's school at Winchester and the backward districts round Cerne; and if he feared that Wulfsgie, who belonged to the more patient reforming school of Dunstan, might not press on fast enough. The tone throughout seems better suited to the bishop's early days¹ than to the later years in which he enjoyed the reputation of a saint—a reputation which at that time almost implies success as a reformer. I see no reason for placing the composition of the Pastoral Letter after 993; the compilation copied in MS. Gg. 3.28 was probably closed about that date; and the codex itself need not be very much later.

To a date so early there is one serious objection. The English Preface to the First Series, found only in this MS., runs:

I, Ælfric, monk and masspriest (though in strength unequal to these orders), was sent in King Æthelred's day by Bishop Ælfheah, Æthelwold's successor,² to a monastery called Cernel, at the request of thane Æthelmær. . . . Then I conceived the plan, I believe by God's grace, of writing this book, etc.

Ælfric became abbot of Eynsham in 1005, and after that date would no longer call himself "monk and masspriest." Ælfheah succeeded Æthelwold in 984, became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1005, and was martyred in 1012. Æthelmær, the son of "Æthelweard dux," founded the Benedictine house at Cernel in 987, and Eynsham Abbey in 1005. So far all the indications are consistent with the

¹ B. Fehr (*op. cit.* p. liii) has shown that the Pastoral Letters for Wulfstan belong to the beginning of Wulfstan's episcopate, not to the end as Dietrich argued. But Fehr (p. xxxviii) thinks that the *Letter for Wulfsgie* is later than the year 1000 because it contains no reference to the approaching end of the world in that year. The argument from silence is dangerous. But a positive statement that the end was near would have no value for close dating in England, as the following facts will show:—(i) The most moving warning of imminent doom is Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Anglos* written in 1012. (ii) The reference to the end of the world which Fehr quotes from the Preface to the First Series was transferred unchanged in MS. C.C.C. 188 to be a permanent part of the first Advent sermon; and this MS. represents a collection that was in Ælfric's own hands after 1005 (see p. 60, below). (iii) Before 1000 Ælfric discusses the end of the world in *Catholic Homilies*, I, pp. 608 ff. "If the end were a thousand years off," he says, "that would not be long." The whole discussion would be idle if he believed, in defiance of the famous Gospel text, that the time could be fixed by the calendar, which he does not mention. (iv) His teaching is explicit in the sermon "for Holy Virgins," which, as I showed in the previous article (pp. 14 ff.), was included in the original issue of the Second Series about 992. "No one except God alone can know when the end will come" (Thorpe, II, pp. 568, 574). This was, I think, the teaching of the English church in the years immediately before 1000.

² To Ælfric, an alumnus of Winchester Cathedral, this would be the familiar description of Ælfheah; it was necessary to distinguish him from the earlier Winchester bishop and saint Ælfheah, who died in 951.

first issue of the First Series in 990-991. But though the interpretation has been questioned on general grounds,¹ "in King Æthelred's day" has not unnaturally been taken to imply that the King was dead, and he died in 1016. Accordingly the *Cambridge History of English Literature* says "the whole preface was composed probably after 1016"; while Thorpe, Dietrich, Miss White, the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and Brandl assume retouching by the author after 1016. But there is a parallel in Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*:²

A very learned monk came north across the Channel from St. Benedict's [Fleury] in King Æthelred's day to Archbishop Dunstan [d. 988], three years before he died; and his name was Abbo. When they were talking together, Dunstan told the story of St. Edmund, as Edmund's sword-bearer had told it to King Athelstan when Dunstan was a young man and the swordbearer was very old. The monk wrote all the story in a book, and when the book came into my hands a few years later, I turned it into English, as it stands hereafter. Within two years [987] this monk Abbo returned home to his monastery, and soon afterwards [988] was appointed abbot there.

The *Lives of the Saints* may be dated between 993 and 998.³ From the passage just cited it is clear that the life of St. Edmund is not a later addition; and the introductory words are of a piece with the

¹ Notably by Cockayne, *Leechdoms*, iii (1866), p. xviii, and B. Fehr, *op. cit.* p. xxxviii.

² Ed. Skeat, *E.E.T.S.* ii, p. 314.

³ The later limit is set by the dedication to Æthelweard, who seems to have died in 998. The earlier limit has been fixed at 996 by Dietrich and later writers, on the ground that Æthelwold is referred to as a saint, and he was translated in that year. But it would be difficult to stretch the "few years later" of the careful preface to St. Edmund as far as 996, so that this *Life* at least is earlier. Besides, the prefaces to the *Lives* indicate a close relation with the *Catholic Homilies*, for which I have proposed the date 990-992; and Ælfric makes it clear that his *Grammar* is the only major work that comes between the *Homilies* and this "quartum librum." Then are the references to Æthelwold decisive? He is twice referred to in the *Lives* as "now working miracles" (i, pp. 264-6 and p. 470). If it be conceded that both passages are original (in the first *halga* may well have been substituted for the regular alliterating adjective *arwurða*, just as *sancte* is interpolated at i, p. 442), still Ælfric himself says in his *Life of Æthelwold* "ad eius mausoleum miracula fieri audivimus, et antequam ossa eius eleuarentur e tumulo, sed et postea" (ed. J. Stevenson, ii, 265). The translation in 996 no doubt marked a great step in the spread of Æthelwold's cult, but it was not necessary for the existence of that cult at Winchester, any more than a formal act was necessary to make Dunstan a saint soon after his death. I incline to place the *Lives* early in the period 993-998. This crowds his principal English works into a few years. But he was uneasy about the policy of Englishing, and from the outset we find him closing the ways against more:—*Catholic Homilies*, ii, 594: "I declare now that henceforth I will never translate Gospel or exposition of the Gospel"; Preface to *Genesis*: "I declare now that I dare not and I will not translate any book [of the Bible] after this book"; Preface to *Lives of Saints*: *Decrevi modo quiescere post quartum librum a tali studio, ne superfluous iudicer.*

text, for they summarise Abbo's dedicatory letter to Dunstan. Evidently Ælfric used the phrase "*in King Æthelred's day*" during the King's reign as a formal indication of date; and this is confirmed when we find *regnante Æthelredo rege Anglorum* in Ælfric's Latin life of Æthelwold, written in 1005-1006.¹

ROYAL MS. 7. C. XII

This is the copy of the First Series to which Thorpe turned when leaves were missing from MS. Gg. 3.28. The contents, which are listed by Wanley (*Catalogue*, pp. 174 ff.), correspond generally with those of Part I of Thorpe's MS., except that the prefaces are lacking. The Royal MS. belonged to Cardinal Wolsey, but its earlier history is unknown.² It is written in two main hands³; the first, which is the more archaic, covering ff. 4-25a and 46-90; the second covering ff. 25b-45 and 91-218a *Explicit hic liber*.⁴ Taken together, they indicate a date near the end of the tenth century.

There are an unusual number of contemporary additions and corrections, some interlined, some in the margins, and two on slips attached to ff. 165a and 169b.⁵ They result in a text which is substantially that of MS. Gg. 3.28, and some undoubtedly repair careless errors or omissions. But closer examination does not suggest that the copyists were abnormally careless. The omissions are often not due to homœoteleuton, which is the usual explanation in a MS. like C.C.C. 188; and when, for instance, *drihtnes* is corrected to *godes* (Thorpe, i, p. 600, l. 2), *sindon* to *beon* (p. 602, l. 12), *getipode* to *forgeaf* (p. 604, l. 4), or the words *pe man deadra manna lic mid*

¹ Ed. J. Stevenson, *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon* (Rolls Series), 1858, ii, p. 265. The date is fixed by Ælfric's statement in the preface that it was written twenty years after Æthelwold's death (August 1, 984), and by the dedication to Kenulf who became bishop of Winchester in 1005-1006, and died soon after his election.

² There are a number of twelfth-century glosses in English which do not show the characteristics to be expected in a book from the South-East. On f. 124b is a late eleventh-century note indicating that the quires were then misbound, though they are now in order: *sêc hêr æfter ofer paræ feorðan cýna*, where *cine* "quire," which Bosworth-Toller Supplement gives only as masculine with short vowel, is feminine and has the vowel marked long. It appears to be the same word as *cine* f. "a chasm, etc."; and the figurative meaning "deep subject" deduced for this word from a passage of Byrhtferth (ed. S. J. Crawford, p. 182) should be replaced by the simple meaning "quire."

³ A third hand writes the first five lines of f. 197b.

⁴ An erasure follows.

⁵ A third slip, which presumably contained the words *Se engel . . . of middangearde* (i, p. 22, ll. 8-13) has been lost between ff. 77 and 78. It repaired an omission due to homœoteleuton.

behætyrfð are struck out after *sealfe* (p. 220, l. 31),¹ we have to do not with a scribe but with a fastidious reviser. The MS. may have been made from very bad copy, such as an author's draft; or it may have been itself the basis for a revision; or it may have been collated with an improved authoritative text; or it may partake of all these characters. The early correcting hands in themselves present a problem. Most of the alterations may be assigned to the scribes, of whom the second is the more active; but a few seem to exhibit other contemporary hands, which are yet near enough to the second to raise embarrassing doubts. Fortunately I can leave these problems for a more detailed study,² and limit attention to two corrections which Wanley noticed.

On f. 64a, in the sermon for Mid-Lent Sunday, after *eallum cristenum folce* (Thorpe i, p. 186, l. 18) a surrounding line secludes a passage of twenty-six lines, beginning *Gif hwa smeað* and ending *smeagunge*, of which, as far as I know, there is no trace in any other manuscript. In the margin, mutilated by the binder, is the following note in a contemporary hand: *ðeos racu [stent] | fullicor on ð[ære] | oðre bec. and w[e hy] | forbudon on [pys-] | sere pylæs þe h[it æ-] | pryt þince gif [heo] | on ægðre bec b[eo]*. "This explanation appears more fully in the second volume, and we forbade it in this, lest it should seem tedious if it appeared in both volumes." An expansion of the cancelled passage is in fact found in the Second Series (Thorpe ii, pp. 198 ff.). Clearly the author of the marginal note is Ælfric himself. When he had finished the First Series and came to compose or revise the sermon for the same day in the Second, he decided to use this matter there, and accordingly cancelled it in the First Volume. The decision may have been made after the First Series was issued, in which case he might circulate his correction; or it may have been made when the First Series was in book form, in the Royal MS. at least, but not yet issued; or it may have been noted in Ælfric's draft—we must attach some meaning to the past tense *forbudon*—and neglected by the copyists. In any event Royal MS

¹ Because words to the same effect occur above in the translation of the Gospel for the day, which Thorpe omits. There is a good deal of evidence to show that Ælfric carefully avoided repetitions which had no stylistic purpose.

² Mr. J. C. Pope of Yale has very courteously communicated to me his survey of the MSS. that contain homilies by Ælfric. He has independently noted the importance of the Royal MS.; and proposes to print the additional passages and sermons in MS. C.C.C. 188, with other unpublished homilies which may reasonably be attributed to Ælfric. It is to be hoped he will undertake the task of collating the important MSS. and re-editing the *Catholic Homilies*.

7. C. XII, which alone has the passage and note, has strong claims to be considered the earliest extant state of the First Series—certainly earlier than MS. Gg. 3.28, which has no trace of the excised passage.

The second notable correction is in the Sermon on St. Andrew, which is made up of two parts, *In Natale* and *Passio*. The Royal MS. has the text as Thorpe prints it from MS. Gg. 3.28; but after the closing Amen, the following words in the text-hand¹ are crossed out:

Hit wære gelimplic, gif þis dæges scortnys us gefafian wolde, þæt we eow þæs halgan apostoles Andrees þrowunge gerehton. Ac we wyllað on oðrum sæle, gif we gesundfulle beoð, eow gelæstan, gif we hwæt lytles hwonlicor gefyldon. Uton nu eadmodlice, etc. (f. 211a). "It would be fitting, if the shortness of the day would permit, to tell you of the holy apostle Andrew's passion. But, if we have health, we will make it good another time, if we have fallen short in any detail. Etc."

I may not have interpreted the last few words correctly, but the significance of the passage is clear enough. The leaders of the Benedictine reform in England knew how important it was that able young monks should be sent from great monastic schools like Winchester into the strongholds of the unreformed clergy, where they could prove their worth in ministering to laymen. Ælfric was called to Cerne not simply as a monk but as a masspriest. In the Preface to his First Series, where he speaks of Cerne, he styles himself "monk and masspriest" instead of, as elsewhere, "monk" and later "abbot." As a masspriest it would be his duty to preach to an ordinary congregation;² and we should think of the *Catholic Homilies* not as literary exercises, but as, in the main, a two years' course of sermons actually preached by Ælfric, and later revised and made available for other priests. This cancelled note belongs to a special occasion—a dark day at the end of November when he could not find time to prepare and deliver an account of St. Andrew's Passion. But he was conscientious about giving full measure. He apologises for the shortness of some of the sermons in the Second Series,³ and we shall find him expanding the shortest of the First Series. He duly completed the Passion with a regular ending, and marked the leaves with some such direction as "After In Natale

¹ I.e. the hand of the second scribe, who is thus proved to be a mechanical worker.

² "On Sundays and feast-days the mass-priest must explain the meaning of the Gospel to the people in English" (Pastoral Letter for Wulfsige, ed. Fehr, p. 14; cf. Letter for Wulfstan, *ibid.* p. 130).

³ Latin Preface "quamvis aliquæ illarum breuitate angustentur."

Sancti Andree," with perhaps an insertion mark at the proper place in the original text. The scribe followed the direction; but, failing to notice that the original closing words must be omitted, he copied them mechanically after the inserted passage, so that they appear after the revised close. If this happened for the first time in the Royal MS., it is the nearest thing to Ælfric's draft. If other copies were made before the error was discovered—and the slavish way in which Anglo-Saxon scribes reproduce gross errors is remarkable—it is still the only extant witness to this early state of the text. As such, it deserves minute study, with close attention to the Latin sources.

CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, MS. 188

Details of the contents of this manuscript—the only other of the First Series that survives—are given in Wanley's *Catalogue*, pp. 123 ff., and in Dr. M. R. James's *Catalogue of the Corpus MSS.* It is written in two hands that would normally be dated round about the year 1025; and there is no mark of ownership before it came into Archbishop Parker's possession.

Dietrich showed conclusively that it contains a later stage of the text than MS. Gg. 3.28, though his view was troubled by a radical misunderstanding of the latter MS. The chief features of the Corpus MS. are these:

(a) It begins, not with the opening sermon of the First Series called *De Initio Creaturæ*, but with Ælfric's treatment of the same subject commonly known as the *Hexameron*.¹ This was probably preferred because it is fuller. We know from its opening words "*On sumum oðrum spelle we sædon hwilon ær*" that it is later than *De Initio Creaturæ*, and it was presumably written after the *Catholic Homilies* had been issued.

(b) In the Second Series of the *Catholic Homilies* Ælfric excused himself from writing a sermon for the Nativity of the Virgin on the grounds of difficulty in matter and doctrine (Thorpe ii, p. 466). Here the day (September 8) is supplied with a short historical account of the birth of the Virgin, and a long discourse on Virginity.² No doubt his friends overcame his doubts by arguing that a feast-day of the first importance could not in practice be left without an

¹ Edited by S. J. Crawford (Bibliothek der ags. Prosa X, Hamburg, 1921) from a good, but late MS., with full variants.

² Printed by B. Assmann, Bibliothek der ags. Prosa III, Kassel, 1889, pp. 24 ff.

expository sermon ; and that it was better to steer a discreet way through the difficulties than leave them to unlearned preachers.

(c) At the appropriate places, there are two other sermons which are not found in Thorpe or the Royal MS. : one for the Third Sunday in Lent, which has been printed by George Stephens from Cotton MS. Faustina A.9 ;¹ the other for the Sunday after Pentecost, which is as yet unprinted. On grounds of language and style, quite apart from their occurrence in this manuscript, they may safely be attributed to Ælfric.

(d) The last sermon in the codex, *In Natale unius Confessoris*,² is introduced by a note which led Wanley to think that this manuscript belonged to Ælfric himself : *Hunc sermonem nuper rogatu uenerandi episcopi Athelwoldi, scilicet Iunioris, anglice transtulimus, quem huius libelli calci inscribi fecimus ne nobis desit, cum ipse habeat*. The younger Æthelwold was bishop of Winchester from 1006 to 1012, or possibly 1014 ; and the composition of the sermon falls between these dates. As Ælfric had become Abbot of Eynsham in 1005, it is a fair inference that C.C.C. MS. 188 is an Eynsham book prepared under his eye, or a close copy of such a book. Presumably he would draft his sermon on wax tablets, make a fair copy to send to Bishop Æthelwold, and order a scribe to transcribe this into a codex for safe-keeping before it was despatched. The Corpus MS. shows no abnormality at the beginning of the new sermon. It is in the same hand (the second scribe's) as the preceding pieces ; the heading is in the ordinary style ; the quiring is normal ; and at the end of the sermon, on the foot of the last page of the manuscript, another, *De Die Iudicii*, has been begun in the usual style, and erased. It is possible that, just when Ælfric had finished his task, a copy of his revised First Series was nearing completion, so that without delaying the despatch of the new piece to Æthelwold, he could order it to be transcribed in regular style and in its natural place at the end of the series of homilies for specific days. But when all the circumstances are considered, there is a balance of probability that the Corpus manuscript is a copy, direct or indirect, from a book in which Ælfric kept a record of his alterations and additions.

¹ *Tvende Oldengelske Digte*, Copenhagen, 1853, p. 81.

² Printed by B. Assmann, *op. cit.* p. 49. One general sermon for such an occasion had already been provided in the Second Series. But the reform movement had multiplied the popular commemorations of confessors, both by its own saints—Dunstan, Æthelwold, Oswald, Wulfsey—and by the inevitable spread of relic cults such as that of St. Judoc ; so that there was a need for an alternative to avoid repetition.

(e) Some of the sermons have been retouched. I need mention only two which Wanley noticed as longer than in other copies. In the sermon for the Second Sunday after Easter, the passage *Be ðisum awrat se witega Ezechiel . . . he bysnað* (Thorpe i, p. 242, ll. 7-24) is omitted; the original text runs on to *life* (p. 244, l. 6); and the matter of the excised passage is then expanded in some 300 manuscript lines. Style and language show that the addition was made by Ælfric,¹ who thus brought this exceptionally short sermon up to normal length.

The sermon for the First Sunday in Advent is also very short in Thorpe's text. In the Corpus MS., instead of the last line printed by Thorpe (i, p. 606), there is a long passage from the English Preface to the First Series, beginning *Men behofiað godre lare, and swiðost*, ending *For swylcum bebodum*,² and followed by new closing words. With so many evidences of his revising hand in the manuscript, we can be fairly sure that this change is also due to Ælfric. It means that so far from modifying his prefaces after Æthelred's death in 1016, he had discarded them before 1014, and used their permanent material elsewhere. Extensive revisions and additions had made this course inevitable. It was no longer possible, even if it were useful now that the *Catholic Homilies* had become firmly established, to claim Sigeric's authority for the whole contents; and it was no longer true to say that the volume contained forty sermons. This is one reason for the absence of the prefaces from all extant manuscripts except MS. Gg. 3.28: Ælfric himself suppressed them.

We have now surveyed the three extant copies of the First Series. Each bears special marks of Ælfric's supervision, and each presents a different stage in the development of the text. The order of the stages corresponds with the probable age of the manuscripts: first Royal MS. 7. C. XII; second MS. Gg. 3.28, which Thorpe printed; third C.C.C. MS. 188; and the latest of the three may possibly have been copied in Ælfric's lifetime if he died about the year 1020. These are the foundations on which an editor must

¹ For instance, the verb *gynan* "to drive" is recorded once in the compound *wiðgynan* "to repel (a doubt)" from Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* (ed. Skeat, i, p. 520), and once as simplex: "*op þæt hi man gynde ongean eft to Judan*" in the same work (ii, p. 108). In the addition the same alliterative phrase occurs: *ðu wylt losian on leathrum and æthleapan þæm hyrde, ac he ðe wyle gynan ongean to ðære cowde* (MS. p. 186).

² Thorpe, p. 2, l. 17 to p. 6, l. 34.

build ; since there is no other copy of the Second Series to compare with MS. Gg. 3.28 ; and the many manuscripts in which different arrangements or selections of the *Catholic Homilies* appear can only be appraised by reference to these three. Yet there is a tiny fraction of the copies that existed in Ælfric's lifetime ; for this was a standard work which every church of any importance would require, and his time was the golden age of Anglo-Saxon book-production. It would be too much to expect that blind chance, saving three copies from the mass, should also save one of each important state. Nor can it be maintained that these three were preserved with special veneration by reason of their close connection with Ælfric : the copies he sent to Æthelweard and to Sigeric, the originals of the sermon he sent to Æthelwold, and of the letters for Wulfsig and Wulfstan, are all lost—whether they went to Canterbury or Winchester, Sherborne or Worcester. The facts are best explained if we suppose that Ælfric was constantly retouching the collection or adding to it at the suggestion of friends ; and that at any given time he would have a copy by him which embodied these alterations. If some one applied to him for the *Catholic Homilies*, he would either lend this authoritative book as a pattern, or more probably, arrange that a copy of it should be made in his own scriptorium. If the new copy went to an important centre, it might there become the model for others ; but still the mechanical habits of Anglo-Saxon scribes and his own repeated urgings to write " according to the pattern " ¹ would tend to preserve the notes he made on the pattern books. In this way many successive states of the text might be issued, of which we happen to have three. They should not be called first, second and third editions, since these terms would suggest that the series is complete in three sharply defined stages.

V

It is now possible to frame more precisely the question from which this excursus began : to which of the three states is the text in MSS. Bodley 340-42 (= R) nearest allied ? Evidently not to the latest, for it has none of the improvements in MS. C.C.C. 188. As between Royal MS. 7. C. XII (= A) and MS. Gg. 3.28, its affinities seem to be with the former. Thus (1) after *handa* (Thorpe i, p. 10, l. 1) R and A have the words *and ealle eorðan he beŷcð on his*

¹ Thorpe, i, p. 8 and ii, p. 2 ; Preface to *Latin Grammar*, repeated in the Preface to *Genesis* ; *Lives of Saints*, i, p. 6.

handa, which are not in Gg.; (2) for *wuldre* (p. 46, l. 21) R has wrongly *wuldor*, A *wuldre* altered from *wuldor*; (3) for *onfoh* (p. 48, l. 4) R, A have *underfoh*; (4) before *fæder* (p. 52, l. 29) R, A have *heofonlica*; (5) R, A have not the Latin at p. 300, l. 20; (6) for *forhtiað* (p. 304, l. 2) R reads *bifiað*, A *biuiað* corrected to *forhtiað*; (7) R, A have not Ælfric's Latin note, p. 304, ll. 9-15;¹ (8) for *ðurh his ænne ancennedan sunu* (p. 500, l. 24) R, A read *ðurh his ancennedan bearne* (*bearn* R); (9) before *Paulus* (p. 520, l. 13) R, A have the words *Salomon cwæð* "Rihtwises mannes sawul is wisdomes setl," which are not in Gg.

It is necessary to distinguish variants of probable authority, such as items (6) and (8), from the idiosyncracies and errors of MS. Gg. 3.28. Thus item (1) is an obvious instance of homœoteleuton in Gg.,² and so is item (9). In items (3) and (4) MS. C.C.C. 188, the latest of the three stages, agrees with R, A. Such readings dissociate R from Gg., but are not evidence of a close relation between R and A.

The best evidence of this relation is their agreement in a free use of the dative after prepositions, where Gg. has the accusative: e.g. Thorpe i, p. 10, l. 26, *ongean god ælmihtigne*: R, A *ongean gode ælmihtigum*; *ibid.* l. 27, *wið þæt werod*: R, A *wið þam werode*; *ibid.* l. 29, *ofer hi ealle*: R, A *ofer him eallum*; p. 50, l. 22, *for his cwelleras*: R, A *for his cwellerum*; p. 132, l. 13 *embe godes beboda*: R, A both originally read *ymbe godes bebodum*; p. 296, l. 22, *oð þisne dægðerlican dæg*: R, A *oð þisum dægðerlicum dæge*; p. 354, l. 1, *þurh oðre halige geearnunga*: R, A *þurh oðrum haligum geearnungum*; p. 402, l. 18, *on ða oðre apostolas*: R, A *on ðam oðrum apostolum*.

It will simplify a complex problem if attention is confined to the common preposition *þurh*, which is found only with the accusative in Old English poetry, in the Vespasian Psalter (Mercian), in the Kentish Psalm and Hymn, and in Alfred's West-Saxon. So, whereas most of the other prepositions ordinarily take dative or accusative according to the meaning, every dative with *þurh* is abnormal; and a local explanation of the abnormality is excluded,

¹ Most, if not all, the Latin gospel texts are squeezed into the Royal MS. by contemporary hands. Latin notes that certainly derive from Ælfric himself are more significant for textual history; but it is hard to decide whether they were omitted in A and R, or were added by the author after the first copies had been issued.

² The words appear in MS. Vitellius C.5, which generally presents a late form of the text.

as might have been expected from the evidence already given that R is a South-Eastern book, probably with a South-Eastern tradition behind it, while A shows no trace of South-Eastern ownership,¹ and is intimately connected with Ælfric's South-Western original. The construction with the dative is evidently late, and might spring up anywhere from the common instrumental use of *purh*, and the analogy of other prepositions with the dative which it overlaps.²

In the Royal MS. the dative is used frequently after *purh*, though not to the exclusion of the accusative; and there is no consistent principle of choice. But a closer examination of the manuscript shows that the province of the dative was originally wider than now appears. There are a number of erasures and alterations which convert it into the accusative: e.g. *purh his wisdom* (Thorpe i, p. 10, l. 6): so A, altered from *wisdome*; *purh deofles swicdom* (p. 20, l. 2): so A, altered from *swicdome*; *purh manna mandæda* (*ibid.* l. 24): so A, altered from *mandædum*; *purh his bearn* (p. 102, l. 14): so A, altered from *bearne*; *purh ða twegen dælas* (p. 130, l. 20): so A, altered from *purh ðam twam dælum*. Again there is no obvious reason why the dative should be sometimes corrected and sometimes left, though the corrector seems to have been more active near the beginning of the manuscript.³

A comparison of the first few sermons in the Royal MS. with the corresponding pieces in R (MS. 340) gives the following results: (i) Where the dative has been altered to the accusative in the Royal MS., R has often the uncorrected dative; e.g. in all except the first of the instances quoted above. This fact, which corresponds with the evidence of items (2) and (6) cited at p. 63, above, is important for the analysis of the corrections in the Royal MS., some of which clearly do not belong to the first issue of the text. (ii) Wherever the dative occurs in R, it stood originally in A.⁴ In fact, in the early sermons the choice of cases, haphazard as it seems, is identical in

¹ See above, p. 56, note 2.

² The MSS. sometimes show variants like *for eallum ðam tacnum* (Th. i, 108, l. 22), where R has *purh*; for *ðam heofenlican leohte* (Th. ii, 548, l. 1); R *purh þæt heofenlice leoht*.

³ There are similar corrections with other prepositions. The questions of syntax involved deserve a dissertation.

⁴ The converse does not hold throughout R, which is not homogeneous in this respect. Thus, *De Initio Creaturæ*, the first sermon in the Royal MS., is also the first in MS. 342, and here there is close agreement in the use of the dative. But at the other end of the volume, in the sermon for the First Sunday in Advent, the Royal MS. has several instances of *purh* with the dative where MS. 342 has the accusative throughout. The difference is probably due to uneven correction of the dative to the accusative in the copies from which R derives.

R and A. For instance, R, A have *purh þæt tacn* (Thorpe, p. 58, l. 14); *purh tacen* (p. 62, l. 12); *purh tacne* (p. 106, l. 4), where the *e* has been erased in the Royal MS. The agreements are such as to exclude coincidence, and there can be no doubt that R is closely related to the earliest extant state of the text in the Royal MS., as against the later states in MSS. Gg. 3.28 and C.C.C. 188.

Turning now to MS. Gg. 3.28, I find no instance of the dative after *purh* in the First Series: the accusative is invariable. For the Second Series, of which Gg. is the only complete copy, the same contrast of regular accusative in Gg. against frequent dative in the corresponding sermons of R might be expected. But it is not so. From the Preface (Thorpe ii, p. 2, l. 18) onwards, the Second Series offers many examples of the dative after *purh* in Gg.,¹ not evenly distributed as they were in the Royal MS. of the First Series, but sometimes isolated, sometimes in patches, as at pp. 304 ff., where there are six instances in five pages. Not only are similar phrases found in one place with the dative and in another with the accusative,² but the two are several times combined in hybrid constructions of the type *ðurh ða treowu* (acc.) and *ðam streawe* (dat.) and *ðam ceafe* (dat.).³ Evidently the two Series contained in MS. Gg. 3.28 derive from separate manuscripts of the First Series and the Second Series which had not the same textual history. Our previous conclusion that MS. Gg. is but a copy is confirmed. And the scribe who made it must have been unusually mechanical, for he not only followed his originals exactly in their divergent treatment of the cases after *purh*, but (as Thorpe first pointed out, supposing it to be

¹ The other prepositions affected seem to be treated similarly in Gg. Thus R. Gottweiss, *Anglia* 28, pp. 380 ff., lists the examples of *ymbe* with the dative in Thorpe's print, and of twelve instances only one is in the First Series.

² *ðurh þæt fyr afeornode* (ii, p. 590, l. 14), but *ðurh ðam fyre fornumene* (*ibid.* l. 27).

³ Ed. Thorpe, ii, p. 590, l. 13. Such hybrid constructions are mostly due to partial correction. The process may be seen, for instance, where (Thorpe i, p. 354, top) A has *ðurh martyrdome oððe ðurh oðrum haligum geearningum*; R substitutes *martyrdom* for the first dative, making a hybrid; Gg. has the accusative in both members. Again at (i, p. 408, top) A originally read *ðurh godcundum tacnum ne ðurh liflicre lare*, but a corrector has altered *liflicre* to the accusative; R reproduces the hybrid thus formed; Gg. has the accusative in both places. It is worth noting that Gg. and R sometimes agree in preserving the hybrid; e.g. *ðurh drycraeft oððe ðurh runstafum* (ii, p. 358, l. 11); or *purh freonda fultum* (acc.) and *æmesdædum* (dat.) and *suidost purh halige* (acc.) *mæssan* (ii, p. 352, l. 25). And there are instances in the original form of A: e.g. *ðurh ðisne geleafan* and *ðurh godum geearningum* (i, p. 294, l. 8). It is possible, then, that some of them may be due to Ælfric himself, especially where the accusative is an abstract noun, and the dative more concrete.

evidence for a change of hand) he regularly spells *middangeard* in the First Series and as regularly *middaneard* in the Second.

To sum up : the earliest state of the First Series in the Royal MS. frequently has the dative after *purh*, and R shows that a text containing these forms was issued. The First Series in Gg. has no such forms ; nor has the later stage shown in MS. C.C.C. 188.¹ All these manuscripts are closely associated with the author. In the Second Series the dative appears in Gg. and the corresponding parts of R.² Clearly, on this evidence, Ælfric is responsible for the abnormal use of the dative in both the First and Second Series as originally issued ; and he regularised his usage with prepositions after the Second Series had been published, revising at least the First Series minutely to bring it into line.³

It is even possible to specify a likely date for the reform. The Second Series was followed by the *Latin Grammar* in which Ælfric gave a considerable space to prepositions and the cases they govern.⁴ The task of explaining Latin usage and translating the examples would bring home to him the anomalies of his own practice in English, and the advantages of regularity.

In that case, one would expect anomalous datives to disappear from his later works. I give a superficial account of the facts, still using *purh* for simplicity :—In the *De Temporibus*, which is closest in

¹ As far as I have checked it. Lack of full collations, particularly for the Cambridge MSS., must be my excuse for neglecting some refinements of method and conclusion. Mr. E. S. Murrell has kindly re-checked for me some critical places in Gg.

² An examination of all the corresponding passages leaves no doubt that the datives after *purh* in Gg. and in R derive from a common source, which is pretty certainly Ælfric's manuscript of the Second Series. For instance, R agrees in all the examples on p. 376 of Thorpe's print. But, as might be expected, Gg. sometimes preserves the dative where R has the accusative : e.g. *ðurh his mandædum* : R *mandæda* (p. 310, l. 5) ; and conversely Gg. has examples of the accusative where R preserves the dative, e.g. *ðurh leahtras* : R *leahtrum* (p. 338, l. 16). Thus R sometimes has readings nearer the original text of the Second Series than Gg. In one place (ii, p. 526, l. 14, after *syfðwilles*) R has words : *and wæstm brohton purh godum weorcum*. *Hi ferdon syfðwilles* that are lost by homœoteleuton in Gg. But as they are found also in MS. Junius 23, this is merely an error of Gg. It is curious that these words should contain an isolated example of *purh* + dative, for elsewhere in this sermon MS. 342 agrees with Gg. in having only the accusative.

³ That Ælfric also corrected the Second Series in this detail is likely but not demonstrable. Late MSS. are poor witnesses on such a point. The best evidence is MS. Vitellius C. 5, dating from about 1025, which contains a few sermons from the Second Series. Usually it has the accusative after *purh*, e.g. in Sermon xxvi, especially p. 376, where R and Gg. have several datives. But even this MS. preserves a few instances of the dative, as in the hybrid *purh ða ealdan æ and ðera witegena cwyðum* (ii, p. 398, l. 13).

⁴ Ed. J. Zupitza, p. 268, beginning, "Case is the one feature of this part of speech."

time to the Second Series, the dative still appears both in Gg. and the separate issue contained in MS. Tiberius B.V.¹ The minor pieces in Gg. which Thorpe prints have only the accusative. So has the Letter for Wulfsgie with which Gg. ends. In the *Latin Grammar* the accusative is regular. The compilation of the *Lives of Saints* followed closely, though single Lives were probably written earlier : ² in the two volumes of Skeat's edition instances of the dative after *purh* are very rare.³ In the Pastoral Letters for Wulfstan there is one example of the dative in a corrupt passage,⁴ but a good MS. has the accusative. The later sermons that have been mentioned already—*Hexameron*, *De Virginitate*, *In Natale Unius Confessoris*—have only the accusative. I may have missed a few examples, but the contrast between the *Catholic Homilies* and *De Temporibus* on the one hand and the later works on the other is confirmatory evidence of Ælfric's change of practice.

That he should be found overhauling the details of his English syntax may come as a surprise to those who think of the tenth century as an uncouth age. But he took an artist's pleasure in all the little things that make for good writing. His handling of the prepositions reveals at once the care that lies behind his finished prose, and the Latin standards by which he moulded it.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

For the completion of the First Series I have proposed the date 990-991 and for the Second 992. It has since occurred to me that Ælfric would arrange his sermons according to the calendar of the year in which he assembled them for publication, or, more probably, the year in which they would first be used by others. In that case something might be inferred from the relative order of fixed and mobile feasts. Attention may be confined to the years 989-995, as the extreme limits which have anywhere been suggested for the

¹ See Bouterwek's *Screadunga*, p. 24, ll. 19 f., where both MSS. have *purh acennedum cildum* . . . *purh forð faren(d)um*.

² Besides St. Mary of Egypt, which is obviously interpolated, I reject on internal evidence Sermon xxxiii, *St. Euphrasia*, as not by Ælfric. Both are misplaced in the annual cycle. Sermon xxiii, *The Seven Sleepers*, is remarkable for a number of rhymes of the type *Mycel is me unbliss minra dyrtinga miss* (ed. Skeat, i, p. 504).

³ I, p. 30, l. 96, *ðurh* . . . *mycelre eadmodnesse*; p. 530, l. 686, *purh pinre leasan tale*. But at ii, p. 128, l. 39 -um in *purh Ostvoldes geearnungum* is a later correction; and *pære* is gen. pl. in *purh pære deofla grimetunge* (p. 294, l. 1206).

⁴ Ed. B. Fehr, p. 80, § 25: *purh þas myngunge* (acc.) and *manegum ofrum wordum* (dat.).

archbishopric of Sigeric, to whom both Series are dedicated. In the First Series the only condition suggested by the order of contents is that Mid-Lent Sunday should not be later than the Annunciation (March 25), a condition which was fulfilled in 989, 991, 992 and 994. The Second Series has more fixed points. The Second Sunday in Lent should not be later than March 12 (St. Gregory), which excludes 990 and 995. Mid-Lent Sunday should follow St. Benedict (March 21): this excludes the other years except 993. But in the second half of the year the order of the Sundays after Pentecost gives a different result: The Ninth Sunday should not be later than July 25 (St. James—Thorpe's date is wrong); and the Twelfth Sunday should not be later than August 15 (the Assumption of the Virgin). These conditions are satisfied in 989, 992 and 994. But as the Sixteenth Sunday is not later than the Nativity of the Virgin (September 8), 994 is excluded. And 989, which was included at all by excess of scruple, is out of the question for the completion of the Second Series. Thus the first half year agrees with the calendar of 993, and the second half of the year agrees with the calendar of 992, which is what one would expect if Ælfric issued the book about Midsummer 992. Then the only calendar that need be considered for the First Series is that of 991, which would suit publication at the turn of 990-991. This line of argument confirms the dates proposed on quite different grounds.

(To be concluded)

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

JOHN FORD AT THE MIDDLE TEMPLE

It is a well-known fact that the dramatist Ford was admitted to the Middle Temple on November 16, 1602. The original Minute Books of the Middle Temple contain some other references to him, which, slight as they are, seem worth recording in the absence of any more detailed knowledge of his life during this period. These entries, which are here transcribed from the original documents, by the kind permission of the Masters of the Bench, may be found calendared in C. T. Martin's *Minutes of the Parliament of the Middle Temple*, vol. ii, pp. 494, 617.

The first is a record of the readmission of Ford to the Temple after an expulsion for debt. It is dated June 10, 1608, and reads as follows :

Whereas Master John Forde hath made his humble petition to the Masters of the Bench at this Parliament to be restored into this Fellowship being expulsed owt of the howse in hillary Tearme *anno tertio Jacobi Regis* as by the Buttery Booke may appeare for the Causes therein mentioned The said Masters of the Bench at this Parliament have ordered that yf the sayd Master Forde doe before the end of this Tearme paye all manner of duties before this tyme due and doe also bring and deliver forty shillings to the Masters of the Bench at the Bench table for his fine imposed [vppon] vppon him by the said Masters of the Bench at this Parliament and shall also then and there submytt him self acknowledging his fault with penitency That then the said Master Forde shalbe restored to the Fellowshippe and societye and shall have and retayne his antiquity according to his first admittance the said former expulsion notwithstanding ; Provided alwayes that yf the Sureties by him formerly geven have eyther discontinued or shall seeme otherwise defectyve to the Treasurer of this howse, that then the said Master Forde before his admittance into comons shall enter new bond with new sureties for the performance of the orders of this House.¹

Neither Mr. J. Bruce Williamson, who very kindly assisted me in my search, nor I have been able to find any record of this expulsion in the Benchers' Minute Books about Hilary Term of the year stated,

¹ *Minute Book D.*, folio 371 recto. (Some of the contractions are here expanded.)

but as the "causes" are said to be mentioned in the Buttery Book his default was almost certainly a failure to pay charges due for Commons—food supplied to him, and possibly some other dues. Unfortunately the earliest Buttery Book now in the possession of the Inn only goes back to 1747.

On November 11, 1616, another John Ford, probably no relation to the dramatist (though several of his relatives and connections were members of the Inn), was admitted to the Middle Temple,¹ and consequently it is impossible to be quite certain to which John Ford the next entry refers; but it is probably to the dramatist and not to his younger namesake. The entry deals with "a conspiracy of and among dyvers gentlemen of this fellowship to break the auncient custom of wearing cappes" at certain specified times. A list of the names of forty delinquents is given, of which that of "Mr. Forde Jo." is the tenth, and the date of the entry is May 30, 1617. The list of names would be set out in order of seniority in the Inn, and as several of them are those of very much older members, a member admitted only six months before could hardly have attained a position so high in the list. The rule compelling the wearing of caps in Hall was apparently much resented by the junior members, and evasions of it were not uncommon; on this occasion it seems to have resulted in open rebellion, and the masters of the Bench, in their position as governing body, decided to take stringent measures to enforce the rule. The entry runs as follows:

Parliamentum tentum XXX^{mo} die maii anno regni domini Jacobi regia & XV^{to} 1617 . . .

Hatts. Wheareas of late theare hath bynn a greate conspiracy of and among dyvers gentlemen of this fellowship to break the auncient custom of wearing cappes in the Temple Hall at dynners, suppers and Breakfasts, and in the Temple Church in prayer tymes and Sermon tymes both in the Tearme tymes and in the Vacation, and in the tyme of Reading, and to bring the same their purpose to passe, dyvers gentlemen of this Societie beeing publickly admonished to the contrary by the masters of the Bench at the cubbord have notwithstanding come in hatts into the Temple Hall and at Breakfast dynner and supper and also into the Temple Church in the tyme of divine Service contrary to the auncient orders of this howse, and because they could not be suffered to weare their hatts in the Temple hall, therefore a greate multitude of them have put them selves owt of commons and dyett them selves some in their chambers and others at victualling howses in the Towne, yt ys therefore at this parliament ordered

¹ C. T. Martin, *Minutes of the Parliament of the Middle Temple*, vol. ii, p. 611.

and agreed by the generall consent of the Masters of the Bench assembled that none of those gentlemen who have so put them selves owt of commons whose names are subscribed under this order shalbe admitted to come ageyne into commons in the Temple untill they have first submytted them selves to the Masters of the Bench according to the auncient orders of this howse and so shall obteyne their good wills to come into commons againe, And all the chambers of such of the same gentlemen as shall not so submytt them selves shalbe seized forfeited and disposed of to the use of the howse.¹

The list of names of the offenders follows, and after this a special admonition to the utterbarristers.

And Further For as much as yt ys an ancient lawdable custom tyme owt of mynd used in this societie to weare capps that professors and students of the Lawe maye in some manner be knownen by their attire which custom by connivency of late used and especially of the Vtterbarristers is now verie lately impugned and ys sought to be altered or overthrowen

it is agreed by the Masters of the Bench that any utterbarristers breaking this rule, and wearing hats instead of caps at the stated times,

shall forfeit for every tyme iijs & iiijd : And shall indure such further punishment as the masters of the Bench shall think fytt. And yf any Vtterbarrister being in commons do suffer anye gentlemen to wear hatts in the Temple Church at prayers or Service Tymes, or in the hall atte dynner, supper or breakfast in the vacation tymes, without warning them owt of commons for the same offence that then every such Vtterbarrister shall endure such censure as shall please the masters of the Bench in the Terme tyme for such connivency to impose vpon them./

There is no record of Ford having ever taken the degree of utterbarrister, and as all calls to the bar are recorded in the Minute Books, it may be assumed that he was never called. On the computation of Mr. Bruce Williamson only about one in three members became utterbarristers. The Inns of Court were regarded as much as places of general education, the equivalents of the Universities, as of special schools preparatory to the law as a profession. It is probable, however, from Ford's long residence in the Temple that he pursued some kind of legal profession though not that of a barrister.

M. JOAN SARGEAUNT.

¹ *Minute Book C.*, folio 228 recto to 229 recto.

WALTON'S COPY OF DONNE'S *LETTERS* (1651)

IN the Salisbury Cathedral Library are preserved twenty-one books which formerly belonged to Izaak Walton. One of these is a copy of Donne's *Letters to Several Persons of Honour* (1651) in which Walton has made numerous textual alterations.

Two of them are corrections of printer's errors :

(1) P. 47, l. 1, 1651 reads :

his continuance is said ever to be smiling

For *continuance* Walton substitutes *countinance*.

(2) P. 60, l. 9, 1651 reads :

I owe you so much of my health, as I would not mingle you in any occasion of repairing it.

For *repairing* Walton substitutes *impairing*.

The ascriptions of two letters are altered : (3) Letter 43 (p. 134) is addressed to Sir Henry Wotton, which is an impossible attribution, since Donne refers to his correspondent's children. Walton erases *Wotton* in the address and substitutes *Goodere* ; but it is unlikely that he possessed any documentary evidence for this or any other alteration, since for the missing surname in the address of (4) Letter 72 (p. 206), which is headed *To my good friend G. H.*, Walton supplies *Herbert*, regardless of the date December 12, 1600, when George Herbert was a child of seven.

Some of the alterations may be considered as Walton's conjectural emendations for elucidating difficult passages, or even for improving Donne's expression :

(5) P. 25, l. 5, 1651 reads :

an ambition of leaving my name in the memory or in the Cabinet.

Walton corrects *the memory* to *your memory*, for which he has the authority of the manuscript of the letter.

(6) P. 25, l. 14 *et seq.*, 1651 incorrectly reads :

I know what dead carkasses things written are, in respect of things spoken. But in things of this kinde, that soule that inanimates them receives debts [MS. *never departs*]¹ from them : The Spirit of God that

¹ A MS. referred to by Gosse (*Life and Letters of John Donne*, vol. ii, p. 122) but now lost.

dictates them in the speaker . . . meets himself again . . . in the eies and ears and hearts of the hearers and readers.

Walton perceives that the 1651 text is bad, but he produces worse confusion by his insertions and erasures. When he has done with it, the central portion reads :

. . . as that soule that inanimates them, receives from them : so The Spirit of God. . . .

(7) P. 29, l. 19, 1651 reads :

These are the two Elements, and he which elemented from these hath the complexion of a good man

Walton inserts *is* between *which* and *elemented*.

(8) P. 42, l. 2, 1651 reads :

If I shall also tell you, that when this place affords any thing worth your hearing, I will be your relator, I think I take so long a day, as you would forget the debt, it appears yet to be so barren. Howsoever with every commodity, I shall say something. . . .

Walton erases *commodity* and substitutes *convenience*.

(9) P. 55, l. 9, 1651 reads :

present M. Fowler with 3 or 4000 li of this since he was so resolved never to leave his place, without a suit of that value.

For *suit* Walton substitutes *some*.

(10) P. 51, l. 18, 1651 reads :

. . . when I submitted myself to such a service, as I thought might employed those poor advantages, which I had. And there I stumbled too, yet I would try again.

Between *might* and *employed* Walton inserts *haue*, he substitutes *abilities* for *advantages*, and to *stumbled too* he adds a marginal note *that is maried*.

The letter from which this passage was taken is printed without corrections at the end of Walton's *Life of Donne* (1658). When he revised this version of the *Life* for the collective issue of 1670, Walton incorporated part of the letter into the new version and used it to illustrate Donne's condition while he was living at Mitcham. Presumably, Walton worked with his copy of the *Letters* before him ; yet he did not transcribe the text as he found it, but omitted clauses

irrelevant to his purpose,¹ inserted explanatory phrases,² and smoothed out some of Donne's rugged sentences; for example, in another letter Donne writes (1651):

I flatter myself in this, that I am dying too: nor can I truly dye faster, by any waste, then by losse of children;

Walton's version (1670) reads:

but I flatter my self with this hope, that I am dying too: for, I cannot waste faster then by such griefs.

When transcribing passage 10 into his *Life*, Walton while preserving one emendation made some further alterations: in the 1670 version, the passage reads:

. . . when I subjected my self to such a service as I thought might exercise my poor abilities: and there I stumbled, and fell too:

Judged by modern standards, Walton's methods may seem indefensible; but he, I think, would excuse himself with a passage from his preface to the *Life of Sanderson*:

I desire to tell the Reader, that in this Relation I have been so bold, as to paraphrase and say what I think he (whom I had the happiness to know well) would have said upon the same occasions; and, if I have err'd in this kind, and cannot now beg pardon of him that lov'd me; yet I do of my Reader, from whom I desire the same favour.

J. E. BUTT.

CONGREVE'S *INCOGNITA*: THE SOURCE OF ITS SETTING, WITH A NOTE ON WILSON'S *BELPHEGOR*

JOHN RAYMOND'S *An Itinerary containyng a Voyage made through Italy, in the yeare 1646 and 1647* (it has also an engraved title, *Il Mercurio Italico*) is a work of some interest. Although it was not published until 1648, Evelyn made use of it, as Dr. H. Maynard Smith has pointed out,³ when compiling his account of his own travels, made some years earlier. I have recently acquired a copy of it bearing on the title-page the signature "Wilt: Congreve,"

¹ *E.g.* 1651, p. 50: "At most, the greatest persons, are but great wens, and excrescences; men of wit and delightfull conversation, but as moales for ornament . . ." omitted.

² *E.g.* *Lives* 1675, p. 26, "but, that I cannot tell what [*i.e.* to do], is no wonder in this time of my sadness" (italicised words inserted by Walton). So, too, *ibid.* p. 67, "my Lent-Sermon at Court."

³ *John Evelyn in Naples*, p. viii, and in *Notes and Queries*.

sufficiently resembling Congreve's authenticated signatures to make its identification probable. The acquisition led me to compare the topographical passages in *Incognita* with Raymond; and to look for the relevant passages in other English works on Italy; I think the passages quoted below show that Congreve was relying on Raymond for his local colour. The discovery of his particular source is not so important as his evident regard for accuracy of detail.

I quote from Mr. Brett-Smith's reprint of *Incognita*, 1922 :

By which means he was enabled, not only to keep Company with, but also to confer many Obligations upon Strangers of Quality, and Gentlemen who travelled from other Countries into *Italy*, of which *Siena* never wanted store, being a Town most delightfully Situate, upon a Noble Hill, and very well suiting with Strangers at first, by reason of the agreeableness and purity of the Air : There also is the quaintness and delicacy of the *Italian* Tongue most likely to be learned, there being many publick Professors of it in that place ; and indeed the very Vulgar of *Siena* do express themselves with an easiness and sweetness surprizing, and even grateful to their Ears who understand not the Language (*Incognita*, p. 10).

Siena . . . stands aloft covering the back of a hill ; so that in the hottest time of the yeare, this City is still refresht by coole gales of winde ; The ayre is very wholesome, much agreeing with the constitution of strangers, the Inhabitants very curteous, a great deale suiting to the humours of forreigners, and besides the purity of the *Italian* Language, is here profest, and spoken ; these and the like conveniences make it much frequented by Travellers, and indeed mov'd us to settle our selves there, for some Moneths. . . . [This was in order] to get some knowledge and practise in the Vulgar Tongue . . . (Raymond, pp. 49, 50).

[They were informed] that a Tilting had been proclaimed, and to that purpose Scaffolds erected around the Spacious Court, before the Church *Di Santa Croce*, where were usually seen all Cavalcades and Shews, performed by Assemblies of the Young Nobility : (*Incognita*, p. 11).

Next to these . . . *Santa Croce* deserves seeing. Before it is a faire spatious Court, in which (it being *Carnavall* time while wee were at *Florence*) we saw the play at *Calce*, with *Cavalcades*, shewes, and other assemblies of the Nobility (Raymond, p. 44).

. . . A Marquess and his Train might have pass'd by as unregarded as a single Fachin or Cobler. Not a Window in the Streets but echoed the tuning of a Lute or thrumming of a Gitarr : for, by the way, the Inhabitants of *Florence* are strangely addicted to the love of Musick, insomuch that scarce their Children can go, before they can scratch some Instrument or other (*Incognita*, p. 12).

They are so addicted to Musick. . . . Neither is the Rout lesse propense to that though with lesser skill and art ; There's no *Fachin*¹ or Cobler but can finger some Instrument ; so that when the heats of the Day are tyr'd out to a coole Evening ; the Streets resound with confused, yet pleasant Notes (Raymond, *Introduction*).

The following are less important :

"A *Villa* of the great Duke's called *Poggio Imperiale*," on the road from Siena, and entering Florence by the *Porta Romana* (*Incognita*, pp. 11, 12) ; Raymond, on his way to Siena, has "Going out of Florence, at the *Porta Romana*, one leaves *Poggio Imperiale* a *Villa* of the great Dukes. . . ." (p. 48). Congreve's other indications of locality are slight, but both he and Raymond call the cathedral the "Dome," and while he has "the Convent of St. *Lawrence*" Raymond has "*Saint Laurents* Church and Convent." Congreve's *Don Ferdinand de Rovori* (p. 11) presumably derives his name from Raymond's "The wife of this present Great Duke, *Ferdinand* the second of that name, comes from the Duke of *Urbino*, of the family of *Rovori*" (p. 47).

A Passage in Wilson's "Belphegor"

The preceding note suggested the examination of a number of Restoration plays with Italian settings. The only one I have found containing any definite topographical statement is Wilson's *Belphegor*; most of the dramatists are content to give only a casual reference or two to well-known monuments or places. Besides the main sources of his plot Wilson, as Dr. Karl Faber has pointed out, used many subsidiary sources, including *Paradise Lost* and *Hudibras*.² Imperia's description of the Villa Doria (Act III, scene i) clearly derives from Richard Lassels's *Voyage of Italy*, first published in 1670.³ The two passages are as follows (I quote from the 1691 text of *Belphegor*, and the 1670 Paris edition of Lassels) :

That thou'dst been with us at Duke *Doria's* Garden ;
The pretty Contest between Art and Nature :
To see the Wilderness, Grots, Arbours, Ponds,
And in the midst, over a stately Fountain,
The *Neptune* of the *Ligurian Sea*,

¹ Mr. Summers has pointed out (Congreve, *Works*, Nonsuch edition, i, 245) that the word "*Fachin*" is not given in the *O.E.D.*, and neither he nor Mr. Brett-Smith mention its occurrence elsewhere. It occurs again in Raymond, p. 210, "a poore *fachin*, or *porter*" ; and in Anthony Munday's *Zeluato*, a work showing strong Italian influence, ed. 1580, p. 110 : "Take heede *Strabino*, least in your denying to looue some gallant Ladys you be not procured to *facie* som poore *Fachine* heere in *Verona*."

² *John Wilsons Dramen : Eine Quellenstudie*, Wiesbaden, 1904. Besides the Villa Doria passage Dr. Faber has over-looked Don Hercio's pigeon-house (III, iii), which is taken from *Lazarillo de Tormes*.

³ For the bibliography of this work, see *Notes and Queries*, vol. clx (1931), p. 292.

Andrea Dorea ; the Man, who first
Taught *Genoa* not to serve.—Then to behold
The curious Water-works, and wanton Streams
Wind here and there, as if they had forgot
Their Errand to the Sea——

...

And then agen, within
That vast prodigious Cage, to see the Groves
Of Myrtle, Orange, Gessamine, beguile
The winged Quire into a Native Warble,
And Pride of their restraint—Then, up and down,
An antiquated Marble, or broken Statue,
Majestick, even in ruine.—

...

And such a glorious Palace !
Such Picture ! Carving ! Furniture—my words
Cannot reach half the Splendor. . . .

. . . Not farre from the Gates, stands the *Villa*, or *Pallace* of the
Duke d'Oria. . . . In the midst of it stands the rare *Fountain* of *Neptune*,
representing the true lookes of Braue *Andrea D'Oria* the *Neptune* of the
Ligurian Sea, and the man who put his country out of *Liuey*, and taught
it, not to serue. All along one side of this *Garden*, stands a *Cage* of *Iron*,
about a hundred paces long ; and so high that it fetcheth in a world of
laurel and other trees, clad with chirping *birds* of seuerall sorts ; and to make
the poore birds beleue that they are rather in a wood, then in a prison,
the very *Cage* hath put euen the wood it self in prison. Then entring
into the *Pallace*, we found it most curiously adorned with rarities, and
riches, suitable to the countrys humour, and the masters purse (Part I,
pp. 91, 92).

In a neighbouring passage *Lassels* writes of

Villas adorned with marbles, painting, statues, *Gardens*, *Arbours* of
Gelsomin, *Orange*, and *Limon* trees, grotts, ponds, *Giunchi d'acqua*,
fountains, high wales, with shades borne up by *Marble Pillars*, etc.
(*ibid.* p. 90).

E. S. DE BEER.

HENRY LAYNG, ASSISTANT IN POPE'S ODYSSEY

AT the conclusion of his notes to the *Odyssey*¹ *Broome* assigned to
himself Books VI, XI and XVIII of the translation, and to *Fenton*
Books IV and XX, implying that the remainder was *Pope's* unaided
work. *Dr. Johnson* corrected this account, presumably of *Pope's*
dictation, and added to *Broome's* credit Books II, VIII, XII, XVI,
and XXIII, and to *Fenton's* Books I and XIX.² The account may

¹ *Odyssey* (1725, 4to), v, 285.

² *Lives of the Poets* (ed. G. B. Hill, 1905), ii, 259 ; iii, 77.

be checked by an examination of the manuscript in the British Museum.¹ Books III, V, VII, IX, "Part of Book X," XIII, XIV "Part of ye fifteenth book," XVII, XXI and XXII are in Pope's hand; Books I, IV, and XX are in a second hand (Fenton's), the copy neatly prepared, in contrast to Pope's much laboured text entrusted to the backs of letters, and the verses numbered.² Broome's books and one of Fenton's are missing.

But Pope, writing of the partnership in his *Postscript to the Odyssey*, assigned to his assistants, beyond what Broome had confessed, "some part of the tenth and fifteenth books"—giving as the amusing motive for this disclosure his desire "to be punctually just."³

Broome, who evidently did not see the *Postscript* before its publication, read Pope's addition with amazement. "Pray in the name of goodness," he wrote Fenton,⁴ "what does he mean in the postscript to the *Odyssey* by affirming some parts of the tenth and fifteenth books are not by his hand?" Broome imputes to Pope the desire to pass off as the work of his dull collaborators some passages of his own translation which he fancied below his average.

Elwin, in his edition of Pope,⁵ annotates Broome's question with "Pope's statement is countenanced by the want, in his manuscript, of 156 lines of translation at the beginning of the tenth book, and of 320 lines at the beginning of the fifteenth." And he quotes, from Spence's *Anecdotes*,⁶ the testimony of "Wilson of Baliol College" 7: "Lang did the eighth or tenth book of the *Odyssey*, and Mr. Pope gave him a twenty-two guinea medal for it." Leslie Stephen, following Spence and Elwin, concludes his account of Pope's *Odyssey* with the remark, "A Mr. Lang is also reported to have translated part of two other books. . . ."⁸ Griffith, in his masterly *Pope Bibliography*, accepts Dr. Johnson's assignment of parts⁹ and makes no mention of Layng.

¹ Add. MS. 4809. For Johnson's comment upon the MS., cf. *Lives*, iii, 141-42.

² Cunningham (in Hill, *op. cit.*, iii, 142, n.) speaks of the MS. of the First and Fourth Books as "crowded with Pope's alterations. . . ." This is gross exaggeration. Alterations there are, but they are never numerous.

³ *Odyssey*, v, 306.

⁴ Pope, *Works* (ed. Elwin and Courthope), viii, 125.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 125, n. 3.

⁶ *Anecdotes* (ed. Singer), 330.

⁷ This must be Thomas Wilson of Balliol, who took his B.A. in 1720.

⁸ *D.N.B.* xlv, 115.

⁹ R. H. Griffith, *Pope Bibliography*, Pt. I (1922), 121.

But previous to the publication, in 1820, of the *Anecdotes*, Layng's claims had already been convincingly urged.

In April 1793 "Indagator" sent to the *Gentleman's Magazine*¹ an extract from a letter written by one "whose veracity no one would venture to impeach, and whose candour is well known through the medium of his *writings*." The letter, headed "Northampton,"² Oct. 26, 1746," comments upon the excellencies of a Rev. Mr. Layng's translation of Tasso. "The whole 16th book will be published soon. Tasso is certainly, next to Homer, Virgil, and Milton, the greatest genius nature ever formed. . . . The English never have had any notion of him : but they will be in raptures, when Layng's Translation appears ; for, his excellency is poetry, and he is now the best poet in England, indisputably. HE TRANSLATED A CONSIDERABLE PART OF POPE'S HOMER, and was VERY INTIMATE with him. He is excessively good natured, and despises fame so much, as rarely to put his name to any thing, and often burns, or gives away, excellent things." "Indagator" adds that though this assertion is too vague to "detract from the general merit of our English Homer," it nevertheless "appears to have been countenanced by, if not originating from, Mr. Layng himself. . . ."

The next number of the *Magazine* contained a letter from T. P. (Thomas Park, the well-known antiquary) confirming the statement of "Indagator."³ Park declares "the fact of Mr. Layng's having assisted Pope in translating Homer does not rest upon the assertion of any other person, but on his own express declaration, wherein he seems anxious to claim his share of a literary honour, which at some former period he had declined acknowledging . . ." and he quotes, from Layng's "Epistle to Lady Charlotte Fermor,"⁴ published in 1748, the lines :

When Pope was charg'd by *Venus* to describe
Belinda, deck'd by all the Sylphine tribe ;
 The blust'ring Winds held in their struggling Breath,
 And ev'ry Storm lay silent, hush'd in Death.
 Now rage ye Winds, your Tears ye Tempests shed,
Belinda rests secure, and *Pope* is dead !

¹ Vol. lxiii, 292-93.

² For more than twenty years Layng's home was at Paulerspury in Northamptonshire.

³ Vol. lxiii, 391-92.

⁴ Lady Charlotte Fermor (or *Farmor*, as Layng spells the name), the daughter of the "blue-stocking" Henrietta Louisa, Countess of Pomfret, married the Rt. Hon. William Finch. The "*Belinda*" of Pope's *Rape* was an Arabella Fermor. Hence the allusion.

Peace to his honour'd Shade—with Laurels crown'd,
 Enthron'd he sate; the Bards stood list'ning round;
 When (meanest of the Train) entranc'd I hung
 To catch the nectar'd Accents from his Tongue;
 Smiling he call'd me thro' the envying Choir,
 And bade me strike the loud *Mæonian* Lyre;
 Trembling I touch'd the Strings; he own'd the Lays;
 Firm I declin'd the Envy, and the Praise.¹

An additional testimony is given by the historian Baker, who, in his account of Paulerspury, declares, surely repeating local tradition, that Layng "translated part of Homer for Pope."²

Who was this Mr. Lang (or Layng, as the name correctly should be spelled³)? Like so many Augustan poets, he was a clergyman. He matriculated at Balliol in May 1715; took his B.A. on February 6, 1718-1719, and his M.A. in April 1722.⁴ From 1726 to 1748 he occupied the rectory of Paulerspury in Northamptonshire; in 1743 he was collated to a prebend in Lincoln Cathedral.⁵ He published *Circe, Translated from the Italian of John Baptist Gelli* . . . (London, 1744), a *Sermon* . . . before the President and Governors of the County Infirmary . . . (Northampton, 1746), and *Several Pieces in Prose and Verse* (London, 1748).⁶

Layng was a student of Italian literature. In April 1747 the *Gentleman's Magazine*⁷ published a specimen of his translation of Tasso's *Jerusalem*, Sixteenth Book, announcing, "As the ingenious translator of this specimen is willing to go through with the six last books, and the three first are admirably done by Mr. Brook, author of *Gustavus Vasa*,⁸ it would be a desirable accession to the *British Poetical treasure*, if some other genius could be found to translate the remaining eleven books with equal elegance." In 1748 Layng included his translation of Books XV and XVI in his *Several Pieces*

¹ *Several Pieces in Prose and Verse* (London, 1748), 3-4.

² G. Baker, *History and Antiquities of the County of Northampton* (London, 1841), ii, 205.

³ So the writer spells his own name, and so Park and Baker and Foster spell it. Elwin and Stephen follow Spence, who transcribes a remark of Wilson's and may never have seen the name written.

⁴ *Alumni Oxonienses, 1715-1886* (ed. J. Foster, 1888), iii, 827.

⁵ Baker, *op. cit.* ii, 205. I have not been able to discover the date of Layng's death. The present Rector of Paulerspury (the Rev. E. K. Browne) kindly searched the church records for me, but in vain.

⁶ A clever verse satire, *The Rod* (Oxford, 1754), is incorrectly ascribed to Layng. It was the work of his son Henry, born at Paulerspury, who took his B.A. at New College in 1753 and was subsequently Fellow of the same college.

⁷ Vol. xvii, 190-91. Vol. xix (86) contains H. Layng's verses "To Alexander Strahan, Esq., on his Translation of Virgil's *Æneis*." Both sets of verses use the heroic couplet.

⁸ Henry Brooke, *Tasso's Jerusalem*, Bks. I to III, R. Dodsley, London, 1738. In the same year there also appeared a translation of Book I by Thomas Hooke.

in *Prose and Verse*,¹ along with a *Life of Tasso* which Philip Doyne, the first after Fairfax to bring out a complete English version of the *Jerusalem*, reprinted at the front of his volume.² Layng translates Tasso into heroic couplets, and regrets in the *Life* that Tasso "chose to write in Stanzas, as *Dante* and *Ariosto* had done, which an *English* Translator must wish he had not done.³ Mr. *Dryden*, and before him Mr. *Cowley*, two very experienced Judges, have declared the Stanza to be very improper for any *grande Opus* in our Languages. . . ." *Several Pieces* further includes a translation into heroic quatrains of one of Bruno's *Epistole Heroiche* and a *Epithalamium* in Latin.

Layng's translation of *Circe*⁴ (London, 1744) boasted an illustrious list of subscribers, including Mr. Pope, Pope's friend Ralph Allen of Bath, and Dr. Joseph Trapp, as well as the Prince and Princess of Wales, and a long array of titled persons. The translation was dedicated to Pope's friend and Layng's patron, Allen, Lord Bathurst.⁵ A significant passage in the Dedication recalls Bathurst's hospitality and his guests, his "long intimacy with Dean *Swift*, Mr. *Addison*, and Bishop *Atterbury*, than whom none were ever more nice or disinterested in the Choice of a few Friends." The tone waxes ecstatic. "But I can scarce forbear exclaiming

Oh ! noctes Cænæque Deum. . . .

When I remember to have seen at your Lordship's Table, my Lord *Lansdown*, Mr. *Prior*, Mr. *Congreve*, Mr. *Gay*, Mr. *Fenton*, and Mr.

¹ This is the "4to volume of *Miscellanies*" to which Park alludes. The poet's name is given on the title-page as "Mr. Layng," but the full name appears at the end of the first poem.

² *The Delivery of Jerusalem. An heroic poem . . . Translated into English blank verse, by P. Doyne. To which is added, the Life of Tasso* [by H. Layng] . . . , Dublin, 1761.

Two years after, Johnson's friend, John Hoole, published his translation of the *Jerusalem* into heroic couplets. Hoole mentions the earlier fragmentary translations into "modern English verse" (i.e. heroic couplets), "particularly those of Mr. *Brooke*, Mr. *Hooke*, and Mr. *Layng*," and confesses to having "incorporated some verses both of Mr. *Brooke's* and Mr. *Layng's* version of *Tasso* with my own. . . ." (Preface, xii-xiii).

³ Hoole adds the regret that Fairfax translated Tasso in stanzas, for stanzas "cannot be read with pleasure by the generality of those who have a taste for English poetry. . . ." (Preface, xi).

⁴ The title-page bears no translator's name, but the dedication is signed "H. Layng."

⁵ Allen Bathurst, created Baron Bathurst in 1711, was Lord of the Manor of Paulerspury, which had been purchased by his father, Sir Benjamin. Layng, who was Rector of Paulerspury from 1726 to 1748, owed his living to Lord Bathurst. According to Baker (*op. cit.*, ii, 204), Layng purchased the advowson from Bathurst and later sold it to his successor, the Rev. Nicholas Jones. By him it was alienated to the warden and scholars of New College, Oxford, who yet hold it.

Pope¹; whom I reserve for the last, as Heaven has done.² Thus *Virgil*, in describing a Group of such Master Spirits, concludes with his principal Figure,

His dantem jura Catonem."

I conclude that Layng enjoyed the friendship of Pope,³ and that he lent him some assistance with the *Odyssey*. The external evidence is sufficiently convincing, going back, it must be supposed, to Layng himself, a man of position and a poet and scholar of more than respectable attainments. Internal evidence can scarcely be forthcoming, for, as Dr. Johnson says of Fenton and Broome,⁴ "How well the two associates performed their parts is well known to the readers of poetry, who have never been able to distinguish their books from those of Pope."

The lacunæ in the manuscript of the *Odyssey*, in conjunction with the testimony of Wilson, would seem to put it beyond reasonable doubt that we may assign to Layng parts of Books X and XV.

AUSTIN WARREN.

WORDSWORTH'S INTIMATIONS OF PALINGENESIA

O joy! that in our embers
Is something that doth live,
That nature yet remembers
What was so fugitive!

It is likely that these lines contained for Wordsworth a picturesque suggestion that the reader is almost certain to miss. As he wrote, he had in mind the stories of the alchemists, that flowers may be re-created from their ashes and made to glow with all their pristine beauty of colour and form. The story is told of a Polish physician "who kept in glasses the ashes of almost all the hearbes that are

¹ Pope dedicated to Lord Bathurst his "moral essay" on the use of riches. His letters to Bathurst were printed (*Works*, ed. Elwin and Courthope, ix, 530-34).

² Prior died in 1731; Congreve in 1729; Fenton in 1730; Gay in 1732; Granville in 1735. Heaven reserved Pope till 1744, the year in which Layng's *Circe* appeared. Bathurst, patron of these illustrious, lived on past the Age of Pope and into the Age of Johnson, the friend of Sterne as he had been the friend of Swift and Addison and Pope.

³ He can scarcely have, in the first instance, owed this to Bathurst, for he was not appointed to the living of Paulerspury till 1726, after the publication of the *Odyssey*. Perhaps his preferment came about through Pope's intercession.

⁴ *Lives of the Poets*, ii, 260.

knowne : so that, when any one out of curiosity, had a desire to see any of them, as, for example, a rose, in one of his glasses, he tooke that where the ashes of a rose were preserved ; and holding it over a lighted candle, so soon as ever it began to feele the heat, you should presently see the ashes begin to move ; which afterwards issuing up, and dispersing themselves about the glasse, you should immediately observe a kind of little dark cloud ; which dividing itself into many parts, it came at length to represent a rose ; but so faire, so fresh, and so perfect a one, that you would have thought it to have been as substantial, and as odoriferous a rose as any that growes on the rose tree." This account is from the section headed "Spectral Flowers" in the second volume of Southey's *Omniana*, who quotes it from "Unheard of Curiosities ; written in French by James Gaffarel, and Englished by Edmund Chilmead, M.A., and Chaplain of Christ Church. Oxon. 1650, p. 136." It will remind most readers of the excellent use made of this old story by Hawthorne in *Dr. Heidegger's Experiment* : "The crushed and dried petals stirred, and assumed a deepening tinge of crimson, as if the flowers were reviving from a death-like slumber ; the slender stalk and twigs of foliage became green ; and there was the rose of half a century, looking as fresh as when Sylvia Ward had first given it to her lover." It may be guessed that the ancient black volume reputed to deal with magic which Dr. Heidegger kept on his table was this same *Unheard of Curiosities*. But the reader of Wordsworth will see little enough connection with anything in his *Ode : Intimations of Immortality*.

My authority for this connection is Coleridge himself, whose mystic philosophy furnished so much of the material for the *Ode*, of most of which one might say that the hand is the hand of Wordsworth, but the voice is the voice of Coleridge. In Essay XI of the Second Section of *The Friend*, as published in 1818, Coleridge gives his own philosophy of many matters dealt with by Wordsworth in the *Ode* ; he quotes a considerable part of the *Ode* as an illustration of his own thought, including the lines given above. In a discussion too long and rambling to quote here in full, he discusses the source of man's idea of "existence in and by itself" : "Hast thou ever said to thyself thoughtfully, IT IS ? heedless in that moment, whether it were a man before thee, or a flower, or a grain of sand ? Without reference, in short, to this or that particular mode or form of existence ? If thou hast indeed attained to this, thou wilt have felt the presence of a mystery, which must have fixed thy spirit in awe

and wonder. The very words, There is nothing ! or There was a time, when there was nothing ! are self-contradictory. There is that within us which repels the proposition with as full and instantaneous light, as if it bore evidence against the fact in the right of its own eternity."

This is, of course, what Wordsworth refers to later in the same section of the *Ode* :

Those obstinate questionings
Of sense and outward things,
Fallings from us, vanishings.

Wordsworth tells us of times in his boyhood when, to quote Vaughan, about similar occasions in his own experience :

On some gilded cloud or flower
My gazing soul would dwell an hour,
And in those weaker glories spy
Some shadows of eternity.

Coleridge goes on to show that these moments of the realisation of absolute being are from nothing except the inner light which comes from God : " Meditate on the nature of a Being whose ideas are creative, and consequently more real, more substantial than the things, that, at the height of their *creaturely* state, are but their dim reflexes." A note by Coleridge on this passage is of the greatest importance just here : " If we may not rather resemble them to the resurgent ashes, with which (according to the tales of the later alchemists) the substantial forms of bird and flower made themselves visible." A reference in this same note refers the reader for a further account of these " flower apparitions " to Southey's *Omniana*, the chapter from which I quoted above.

Let us come back to Southey, then. He gives accounts from various authors of such palingenesia, as it was called, not merely of plants but of animals. Sir Kenelm Digby had a way of re-creating cray-fish on which the Abbé de Vallemont comments : " Cela est plus utile que la Palingénésie des plantes dans les fioles. Il y a là du solide. Il y a plus qu'à voir ; il y a à manger." Southey quotes the Abbé further, in a passage that is of special interest in connection with Wordsworth's phrasing in the first line prefixed to this discussion ; it seems more than probable that Wordsworth had read it, as Southey and Coleridge certainly had : " C'est élever la Palingénésie au dernier degré du merveilleux, que de se former l'idée de la pratiquer sur les cendres mêmes des animaux, et peut-être des hommes.

Que ce seroit un enchantement bien doux, pour Madame la Marquise de . . . de pouvoir jouir du plaisir de voir l'ombre et le fantôme de son défunt perroquet ! Franchement ce seroit une jolie chose, que de voir ainsi dans une fiole une perroquet résusciter du milieu de ces cendres."

It is but a step from this account of the joy of seeing a dead bird re-created from its ashes to thoughts of human palingenesia :

O joy ! that in *our* embers

is but an echo of the Abbé's words given above. "Embers" for ashes, or "cendres" from which the re-creation comes seems odd at first ; but *ashes* is hardly a word which the poet can use well, while embers is easy to handle and suggests its own rhyme.

I quote, finally, Southey's comment on the lines of the Abbé de Vallemont : "So firmly indeed was the Palingenesia believed by men of learning, that it was frequently insisted on by divines as a proof of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body." Southey closes his discussion with a quotation from Cotton Mather's introduction to his life of Sir William Phips, in which Mather remarks that it is hard to produce our belief "that an ingenious man may have the whole Ark of Noah in his own study, and raise the fine shape of an animal out of its ashes at his pleasure ; and, that by the like method from the essential salts of the human dusts, a philosopher may, without any criminal necromancy, call up the shape of any dead ancestors from the dust whereinto his body has been incinerated. The resurrection of the dead will be as just, as great an article of our creed, although the relations of these learned men should pass for incredible romances ; but yet there is an anticipation of that blessed resurrection, carrying in it some resemblance of those curiosities, which is performed, when we do in a book, as in a glass, reserve the history of our departed friends ; and by bringing our warm affections into such an history, we revive, as it were, out of their ashes the true shape of those friends, and bring to a fresh view what was memorable and imitable in them."

Just such an intimation of future life from embers Wordsworth, too, found in memory—the memory of moods of our own past childhood. Wordsworth's lines take on much more meaning when read in connection with the comments on Palingenesia that both Southey and Coleridge were familiar with and that the latter must have talked over with Wordsworth in May and June, 1802,

when the *Ode* was being composed. One might even conjecture that the Abbé was included in the sackful of books that Coleridge was lugging from Keswick to Grasmere, along with a branch of mountain ash, on June 10, when, as Dorothy Wordsworth tells us in her *Journal*, the mild philosopher, thus heavily laden with philosophy and nature, was "attacked by a cow" as he made his way to Dove Cottage.

JOHN D. REA.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PLACE-NAMES OF SUSSEX

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

DEAR SIR,

The review of the *Place-names of Sussex* in your October issue is so generous that one may venture perhaps to raise a few points with regard to certain general criticisms as to the form and arrangement of the volumes made by your reviewer, for in an enterprise of this kind we are naturally most anxious to do all we can to meet the needs of the general public.

May we say at the outset that the volumes themselves show that there is no real warrant for the statement that "the editors have decided to complete these surveys with an arrangement and presentation which is to remain unchanged"? The volumes already issued show that quite clearly. They show it, for example, in the matter of maps. We have been continually seeking the best solution of a difficult problem. The result has been that we have already tried four different types of map or maps: (1) In the Buckinghamshire volume, (2) in the Bedfordshire-Huntingdonshire volume, (3) in the Worcestershire volume, (4) in the North Riding of Yorkshire, Sussex, and Devon volumes. We may add, what your reviewer could not know, that we are still unsatisfied, and that at the last meeting of the Council of the Place-name Society, it was decided to experiment yet further in this matter. The whole business is quite as much one of expense as of convenience. There are those who value highly for various purposes that type of map which we have recently provided, and which for a large county is necessarily unwieldy. Equally necessary for other purposes are smaller sketch

maps such as your reviewer speaks of. We are going to make an attempt to provide these, but it all has to be done on a 15s. subscription.

The volumes also show change and development in the character of the material and its arrangement. The earlier volumes confined themselves almost entirely to names for which we had material dating from before 1500. That principle has gradually been abrogated, and in the Sussex volumes and onwards, we are including almost every name for which we have evidence before 1800. Further, whereas in the earlier volumes, within each parish we arranged the names just in alphabetical order, in the Sussex volumes and onwards, we have arranged those names under types and have put together, at the end of each parish, names of little import or names for which the material available at present does not warrant any interpretation.

In the matter of indexes, the decision to have one index for Sussex was only made after a careful balancing of advantage and disadvantage. Sussex happened to fall into two clearly-marked halves—the three western Rapes and the three eastern Rapes—but supposing we had made an index to each part, it is certain that we should have had protests from exasperated users of the volumes, who would have said, “Why do you make me hunt through two indexes if I want to find such places as Edburton, Poynings, Henfield, Twineham, Patching, Fulking? How can you expect me to know whether they are in the Rape of Bramber or the Rape of Lewes?”—for it would puzzle even your good Sussex man to answer readily whether those places were in the Rape of Bramber or the Rape of Lewes, and therefore whether they fall into Volume VI or Volume VII, and for non-Sussex men the possibilities of exasperated complaint would be far larger. The same problem has faced us in Devon, and there, beyond question, a single index was the only solution. We were unable to divide the county as between north and south or east and west, for those expressions are entirely vague, and have no official authority. North Devon means little more than Exmoor and the north coast, while South Devon means Dartmoor and the south coast. A similar vagueness attaches to east and west, and who should say if Crediton and Okehampton are in North or South Devon, or if Chulmleigh and Chagford are in East or West Devon? Our volumes as ultimately arranged do travel roughly across Devon from west to east, but we deliberately avoided the difficulties which would arise if a reader wished to find what we had to say about

Chulmleigh or Chagford and a hundred other names, and did not know in which volume to look for them.

Your reviewer raises the point that the volumes are made difficult for use by the layman by the failure to translate the second elements in place-names, the reader being referred for the explanation of many of these elements to the little volume entitled *Chief Elements in English Place-names*. In this matter we have found ourselves, like the promoters of similar surveys in Norway and Sweden, which began before us, and of the survey in Denmark, which began after us, obliged alike on grounds of economy and of true scholarship, to adopt the plan of reference to a small introductory volume. It was necessary on the score of economy, for one cannot afford to print more than is absolutely necessary, but still more was it necessary on scholarly grounds. There are a large number of elements in our place-names which you cannot translate by a single word, or even by two or three words. All place-name scholars would agree that any attempt, for example, to translate *ham*, *by*, *leah*, *hop*, *ingtun*, *thorp*, by some regular phrase, would be entirely misleading, and in so far as we may, from time to time, have been lured into translating such elements, we may well have erred against the truth. What you must do in the case of these doubtful elements is to refer the reader to a balanced statement as to the meaning, which is to be found in the *Elements* volume. Where it is possible to offer an exact translation we have, especially in our most recent volumes, attempted to do so, wherever the meaning was not obvious.

Much as we should like it, we fear that it is an impossible ideal that our volumes should be prepared on such lines that they might accompany the fisherman, the cyclist, or the hiker on his expeditions without undue loading of his impedimenta. If, in spite of all difficulties he has managed to take the volume or volumes with him, the 8½ ounces of the *Chief Elements* should not deter him.

We are,

Yours faithfully,

ALLEN MAWER,
F. M. STENTON.

REVIEWS

Lydgate's Siege of Thebes, Part II. Edited by AXEL ERDMANN and EILERT EKWALL. Early English Text Society, Extra Series. CXXV. London: Humphrey Milford. 1930. Pp. xvi+220. 20s.

THIS publication of the Early English Text Society contains the introduction and notes to Lydgate's poem, the text of which was published by Erdmann in 1911 (E.E.T.S., E.S., cvii). Erdmann had collected some of the material for this second volume, but he died before the work was complete and Professor Ekwall is responsible for the present form of the book and for a good deal of new matter. He has discovered a manuscript which Erdmann had overlooked—MS. Christchurch Library 152; this he describes in an Appendix, correcting the mis-statement made by Miss Hammond in her *Chaucer Manual* that its text of the poem is fragmentary.

The source of Lydgate's poem is discussed in the first chapter. The exact source does not exist, but Professor Ekwall proves that the version of the *Roman de Thebes* known as *le Roman de edipus*, is nearest to it of all the extant versions. Lydgate never mentions this source and he evidently felt himself at liberty to treat it with considerably more freedom than he did that of his *Troy Book*. He uses Boccaccio's *De genealogia deorum* for certain additions, and here he acknowledges his source and remains much more faithful to it.

Professor Ekwall offers some defence of Lydgate's style and metre in this poem, maintaining that, though the Monk was certainly careless about his sentence structure, he is not difficult to follow, nor is his work entirely devoid of poetical merit. The roughness of many of the lines is probably due to the corrupt state of the manuscripts and slight alterations will often render them correct. The discussion of the relations of the manuscripts makes it clear that there was ample opportunity for corruptions to arise in them. Those that survive are all derived from a lost copy of Lydgate's original manuscript, and since all the manuscripts share certain errors, this copy itself must have been faulty. It seems that

Lydgate did not even "take the pains of reading over the first copy of his poem" (p. 93).

The descriptions of the extant manuscripts are very full and include comments on their spelling peculiarities and some discussion, in relation to MS. Arundel 119 (the basis of Erdmann's text), of the treatment of "tags."

As we should expect, Professor Ekwall has dealt thoroughly with the language of the poem. He notes that Lydgate differs from Chaucer in using almost always the \ddot{z} development of O.E. \ddot{y} , but that he follows him in his use of the final $-e$ and is successful in preserving the traditional pronunciation of it in verse at a time when it was no longer pronounced in ordinary speech. In this poem, as elsewhere, Lydgate's vocabulary is more modern than Chaucer's and includes a number of words (French loan-words in particular) still in use to-day, but not found in Chaucer's works. Professor Ekwall shows that Lydgate's "copious vocabulary" often led him to make excessive use of synonyms such as "slaughter and occisioun," "wisdam and sapience."

The notes are numerous and deal with Lydgate's alterations of his source, and with the grammatical and syntactical features of the poem. Some of them reveal the poet's carelessness in yet another direction. In spite of his professed admiration for Chaucer and his constant indebtedness to him, he apparently did not trouble to re-read his master's work when writing the *Siege*, and he consequently makes such mistakes as the attribution of the "face of Cherubyn" to the Pardoner instead of to the Summoner.

Students of Lydgate and of the fifteenth century will be grateful to Professor Ekwall for so adequately completing Erdmann's work. The volume is a valuable contribution to our knowledge, not only of Lydgate's methods of composition, but of his language and metre.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

The Northern Passion: Supplement. Edited by WILHELM HEUSER, Ph.D. and FRANCES A. FOSTER, Ph.D. London: Humphrey Milford. E.E.T.S. 1930. Pp. xii+142. 7s. 6d. net.

FOUR MSS. of the *Northern Passion* were printed in Part I of Miss Foster's edition (E.E.T.S. Original Series 145), while in Part II

(E.E.T.S. Original Series 147) she gave the French text from which the English versions were in all probability drawn, together with various fragments of other extant versions. The present volume prints the text of two further English versions, Oxford MS. Rawlinson Poetry 175 and Cambridge University MS. Gg. I, i. In her preface, Miss Foster explains that, when she undertook her task, she was unaware that Dr. Wilhelm Heuser had already made considerable progress towards an edition of these two MSS. for the E.E.T.S. Since neither text had been included in her edition, and since Dr. Heuser's material was available she undertook this supplementary volume at the suggestion of Sir Israel Gollancz. Dr. Heuser is responsible for the side-notes up to p. 105, but the remainder, together with general revision and a collation of his proofs with the MSS., are the work of Miss Foster.

As she points out, these two MSS. are important for the detailed study of the history of the poem, representing as they do the earliest extant English versions of the original and the expanded text, respectively. The whole question of the relationship of the various MSS. and of the development of the expanded version, together with the much-vexed problem of the borrowings from the *Passion* poems in the play-cycles, is yet far from any final solution. Miss Foster has interesting suggestions to offer as to the grouping of the MSS.; but, as she herself admits, a thorough study of their relationship has yet to be made, and can only be made by a scholar with access to all the extant MSS.

HELEN T. McM. BUCKHURST.

Early Scholastic Colloquies. Edited by the late W. H. STEVENSON. [*Anecdota Oxoniensia*: Mediæval and Modern Series. Part XV.] Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1929. Pp. xi+115. 10s. 6d. net.

THE late Librarian of St. John's College, Oxford, Mr. W. H. Stevenson, had in his care an eleventh-century Codex (No. 154), containing, *inter alia*, five early scholastic colloquies: (1) *Colloquia de raris fabulis* (Latin without glosses); (2) *Ælfrici Batæ Colloquia* (Latin with O.E. glosses); (3) *Eiusdem Colloquia difficiliora* (Latin with O.E. glosses); (4) *Ælfrici Abbatis Colloquia ab Ælfrico Bata*

aucta (Latin with O.E. glosses); (5) *Liber Albonis Anglice interpretatus* (fragment of 2 pp.; Latin with O.E. interlinear gloss). By incorporating with these the O.E. interlinear gloss to the Colloquies of Ælfric Abbas (Cotton Tiberius A III), completing the fragment (5) from Harleian MSS. 3271, and adding two Bodleian Colloquies: (a) *De raris fabulis* (Latin with Celtic gloss), and (b) a Hisperic Colloquy, Mr. Stevenson secured a collection of early scholastic works of unusual completeness and interest. At his death he had passed for press the entire body of texts with apparatus, but had not written his Introduction or Glossary, which have been entrusted to the scholar best qualified to provide them, Professor W. M. Lindsay. These Colloquies, Mr. Lindsay tells us, have their origin in a manual (c. 200 A.D.) for Greeks learning Latin and Latin speakers learning Greek; and this—the *Hermeneumata Pseudo-Dositheana*—is unmistakably reflected in Mr. Stevenson's first Colloquy, *De raris Fabulis*, a text containing Celtic glosses, and probably written on the Welsh borders in the tenth century.

The task of memorising a new vocabulary after the manner of the *Hermeneumata* was made for English boys easier and more agreeable by the genial and humane Ælfric Abbas, who devised the game of making his pupils assume characters (*piscator, auceps, mercator*, etc.). We owe the preservation of Ælfric's Colloquies to his disciple, Ælfric Bata, but they were embedded in Bata's extensions; and, in enlarging his original, he marred it so sadly that Professor Lindsay writes him down with Dogberry. But these and many other matters both entertaining and valuable the reader will find in Professor Lindsay's Introduction. One is grateful to Professor Lindsay and to those responsible for the *Anecdota* for securing the completion of Mr. Stevenson's work, which in its inception was itself an act of scholarly piety. The St. John's College Codex is a treasure of unusual interest. It was one of the early possessions of the Monastery of Durham. Its first leaf bears the inscription, *Liber Sancti Cuthberti de Dunelmo*; and on the second leaf, in a note in the hand of Dr. Christopher Wren, the College Librarian (father of Sir Christopher Wren), we are told that it was presented to the Library by a member of the College in 1611.

A. W. REED.

English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey. Edited with Introductions and Notes by ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND. Cambridge University Press. 1927. Pp. xii+591. 32s. 6d.

IN this handsome volume of 590 pages Miss Hammond explores the century and a half that separate the death of Chaucer from the birth of Spenser. Wisely, we think, she has confined her selections to the formal or conventional verse of the period. She omits the ballad, romance and drama, religious verse and the Scottish Chaucerians; but in her General Introduction the student will find these referred to in their due place in a full and useful survey of the whole period. The texts are either complete, as in the case of Lydgate's *Danse Macabre* and Skelton's *Garland of Laurel*, or long representative extracts are given, as in Walton's verse rendering of Boethius, the *Libel of English Policy* and Barclay's *Eclogues* and *Ship of Fools*. Here, better than in any other single book, the student may come to know Hoccleve and Lydgate and their anonymous contemporaries. He will meet the works of Charles d'Orleans in English and in French, and make the acquaintance of John Shirley, collector and copyist of Chaucer. He will find *The Court of Sapience*, *London Lickpenny*, George Cavendish's *Metrical Visions* and Henry, Lord Morley's translation of the *Triomfi* of Petrarch. This considerable body of material is accompanied by a series of separate Introductions, bibliographical and critical; there are also seventeen Reference Lists. These Lists and Introductions are, in their way, unique; Lydgate, for instance, to whom over one hundred pages are devoted, is more fully and adequately dealt with here than in any other handbook. One may not accept all Miss Hammond's judgments. "Senility," for example, is the last infirmity to be attributed to "young Stephen Hawes"; nor is "fluency" a distinguishing characteristic of Skelton. On the other hand it is important to be shown how many words first made their appearance in English in the pages of Lydgate. Miss Hammond's list opens with *abuse*, *adjacent*, *adolescence*, *aggregate*, *arable*, *attempt*, *auburn*, *avaricious*, and contains the significant adjective, *gentlemanly*. Nor is it only for her Texts, Introductions, Lists and Bibliographies that we are indebted to Miss Hammond. Reference must be made also to the body of explanatory notes and comments that occupy the last 150 pages of the volume. So full, indeed, is the book of valuable aids to the student that the Notes may be overlooked. It were

unhappy should this be so, for Miss Hammond has lived with her texts; and her Notes contain many evidences of her exploratory thoroughness. There, for example, one finds her transcript of the Lille MS. of the French original of Lydgate's *Danse Macabre*. The price of Miss Hammond's book, though in itself reasonable, probably puts it beyond the reach of most students, but it should be accessible to them in their College Libraries.

A. W. REED.

A Spenser Handbook. By H. S. V. JONES. New York: Crofts, 1930. Pp. x+419. \$2.

WE are already indebted to Mr. Jones for two contributions to Spenser studies. The present work, as its title implies, is in no way a work of original scholarship, but an attempt "to make conveniently available our present knowledge of Spenser and his poetry." The difficulty lies in defining the word "knowledge," for Spenser's life and poetry are somewhat elusive of fact, though correspondingly productive in conjecture and controversy. Mr. Jones leaps over this stile gallantly. "In controversial matters I have tried to be judicious where I had no space to be argumentative. Particularly have I been at pains to include whatever might give support to views that differ from my own." The volume is characterised by restraint. There are thirty-two chapters. The first, *The Age of Spenser*, might easily have been spared: it is below the standard of the rest of the volume. There follow *The Life of Spenser*, one chapter to each of the minor poems, one general chapter to *The Faerie Queene*, followed by one chapter to each book, one to the prose *View of the Present State of Ireland*, one to the Harvey-Spenser letters, and one to *Language and Versification*. The field is enormous, and on the whole the author has been highly successful in marshalling his material. Some chapters show the results of inevitable cutting-down, either ending abruptly, or appearing never really to tackle the problems presented. But on the whole Mr. Jones's *Handbook* is a solid and presentable work.

One very clear difficulty arises from the compiler's strict avoidance of reference to authorities. The system employed of appending to each chapter a list of relative articles and publications, whether used in the chapter or not, does not materially help the student who may

want to check a statement. To the general chapter on *The Faerie Queene* is appended a list of forty-five publications—a formidable array for the student to tackle when investigating details—though infinitely valuable in itself, and by no means unwanted even after Carpenter's excellent *Bibliography*. Only a few misprints occur: Hobbinal (p. 44), Weepley (*bis*) for Welply (p. 38), and Wilson, I. P. for Wilson, F. P. (p. 38).

Mr. Jones is evidently more impressed by the philosophical trend of Spenser's genius than by what was purely creative, and tends to give undue consideration to his philosophical and artistic sources. In his chapters on *The Faerie Queene*, where concision was, of course, most necessary, this bias is most discernible, and reveals Mr. Jones's personal studies to the full (he has already written on *The Faerie Queene and the Mediæval Aristotelian Tradition*). In view of the full treatment accorded to the philosophical and artistic sources this tendency to avoid discussing the pure poetry in Spenser, and to minimise the nature and extent of the political allegory in *The Faerie Queene*, or rather the unwillingness to explore the political allegory, becomes very noticeable. But the book is an excellent one of its kind.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe. General Editor, R. H. CASE. Vol. I, *THE LIFE OF CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE*, by C. F. TUCKER BROOKE, and *DIDO, QUEEN OF CARTHAGE*, edited by the same. London: Methuen. 1930. Pp. x+238. 8s. 6d. net.

It is high time that Marlowe, as Shakespeare's greatest forerunner, should be given the dignity of a new edition with full critical apparatus; and such an edition Professor Case has launched on the excellent model of the Arden Shakespeare that he steered so successfully to harbour not long ago. Happily the paper and type of this series, which perhaps will not be so much in the hands of examination candidates, is a great improvement on that of the Arden Shakespeare, and the correspondingly higher price should not be grudged. It is this very fact, that the volumes are intended for the more advanced student, that makes one question the necessity of modernising the spelling, in spite of the general editor's defence of

it. Miss Ellis-Fermor, at least, has obviously bowed with regret to the ruling in Vol. II,¹ and has solaced herself by occasionally keeping the original spelling in illustrative quotations. The promised addition of indices and bibliographies in each volume is welcome; unfortunately this promise is not fully kept in Vol. I, where there is indeed a bibliography for *Dido*, but none for the more difficult subject of Marlowe's life. The supplying of this in the next issue would spare the student the necessity of compiling his own bibliography from the footnotes.

In Vol. I of the series, Professor Tucker Brooke, as the chief living authority on Marlowe, carries out his avowed aim, that of an "unspectacular interpretation" of the known facts of Marlowe's life, with his usual admirable control of a mass of detail, seasoned by occasional dry and pungent comment. Yet the Elizabethan Age was a spectacular one, and to judge it solely from the standpoint of our more mechanical and law-abiding time is to be in danger of missing some of its aspects. At times, as in the question of the character and credibility of Marlowe's slayer and his associates, Professor Tucker Brooke seems to be content with the facts, and to be unwilling to face the implication of those facts. At other times there is something a little naïve in his attitude towards the cynical methods of the period. Thus, his desire to uphold Poley's presumed contribution to the evidence leads him to accept all statements of that avowed liar at their face value; for instance, Poley said to the Yeomans that he had married Mistress Watson, and may indeed have done so, but there is as yet no proof of it; he represented himself as a Roman Catholic in the Babington Plot, but there is no proof and little probability that he was one. For such an edition as this caution is laudable, but hardly a disregard of the reasons for another point of view. Yet Professor Tucker Brooke has the right to limit his conclusions to the documents, and he will find strong support, notably from Dr. F. S. Boas.

Of fresh material Professor Tucker Brooke has much to give, and the student has reason to be grateful to him. The additional matter on Marlowe's family makes the comparatively slight information given by Ingram full, precise and detailed, and the wills given in the first three of the Appendices have not been printed before. When there are so many appendices, it seems greedy to ask for yet another, but it would be useful to have this precise knowledge on

¹ To be reviewed in a future issue.

Marlo
table
fact of
knowl
if rath
good
Shake
Bacon
Keats
Yet t
on th
mino
can b
A
the E
him
para
and
to a
for v
(pp.
Stra
nam
one
shoe
secc
Bro
as i
him
"le
alre
me
Lar
But
the
Tu
wi
an
an

Marlowe's family made more easy of apprehension by a genealogical table. Several points of interest emerge, such as the unrealised fact of Marlowe's many sisters, which affects our view of Marlowe's knowledge of feminine psychology, and also gives rise to a charming, if rather puzzling comment on *Dido* (p. 212). The biographer does good service in showing Marlowe's social status to have been, like Shakespeare's, free from sordidness—another weapon against the Baconian heresy. We are glad, too, to realise that Marlowe, like Keats, before the age of seventeen shows little sign of undue precocity. Yet the usual irony of discovery prevails, which reveals so much on the uninspired relations, and so little on the inspired poet. One minor point, the duplication of the marriage entry of Joan Marlow, can be paralleled in the life of the poet Phineas Fletcher.

Again, the comparison (pp. 58-60) of Marlowe's treatment by the Privy Council with that of others summoned is useful in setting him against a historical background. Yet the cases are not precise parallels; in no other case cited is the person to be apprehended; and does not the rider, "And in case of need to require aid," point to a forcible arrest if necessary, and confirm Marlowe's reputation for violence? The discussion on the identity of Marlowe's "lord" (pp. 46 ff.) calls forth the new and interesting suggestion of Lord Strange for this part; but Strange ("most ingenious Darby"), named by Chapman in the preface to *The Shadow of Night* as himself one of the coterie of knowledge-seekers, was as little likely to be shocked at Marlowe's unorthodoxy, as Raleigh at his possible secret errands to King James. Occasionally Professor Tucker Brooke seems to read into the documents a little more than is there, as in his interpretation (pp. 71-72) of Kyd's phrase "when I saw him last," or in his statement that the elopement of Joan Yeomans "led to divorce proceedings." Occasionally, later knowledge has already invalidated a statement, as on the period of Poley's imprisonment (p. 74, contrast *R.E.S.*, July 1929, v, 281), or on the York and Lancaster plays as all undoubted parts of the Marlovian canon. But this is the fate of all adventurers in this debatable ground, and the permanent value of the *Life* lies in the new wings that Professor Tucker Brooke has added to the slowly-built edifice, and in the light with which brilliant comments flood the whole structure.

In *Dido* Professor Tucker Brooke turns to less controversial and more gracious material, approaching it inevitably from the angle opposite to that from which Dr. McKerrow viewed it in his

edition of Nashe. Professor Tucker Brooke makes no attempt at a reasoned apportionment of the work between its two authors, but his notes do so indirectly by adducing parallels of thought and wording from Marlowe's, or occasionally from Nashe's work. The two editors do not always agree. Professor Tucker Brooke accepts (p. 115) the first two conclusions of Dr. Kuniatowski which to Dr. McKerrow seemed "somewhat speculative"; the possibility of collaboration is not discussed. Both, however, see in Virgil Marlowe's direct source; this is a hopeful sign of his youthful ardour; he is writing as a poet, not as a hack playwright. The freedom with which the Virgilian epic style is turned to dramatic use is delightfully illustrated, as in I, i, 233. It is interesting to see the "romanticising" of Virgil's "mollis amaracus" that comes in Venus' speech (II, i, 316 ff.), and amusing to remember Dryden's objection to the "village-word," sweet marjoram, and his translation of it into "a flowery bed." Professor Tucker Brooke has many illuminating comments to make, notably on the acting of III, i, 95, on the naïveté of Dido (III, iii, 7) or on the villainy of Iarbas (III, iii, 73). I cannot help regretting that he takes Bullen's view (p. 160) that the Hecuba speech in *Hamlet* is a burlesque of Æneas' description here of Troy's fall; Hamlet's approval of the speech and of the player's emotion go far to show that, whatever the purpose of its composition, it was a sympathetic imitation of this more rhetorical fashion.

Professor Tucker Brooke clears up the difficult characterisation of the Spartan courtier as "vain and wild" (III, i, 156), but leaves the equally difficult lines,

Achates, thou shalt be so meanly clad
As sea-born nymphs shall swarm about thy ships (III, i, 127)

with the rather unconvincing explanation of "meanly" as "normally." Is it too bold to suggest *mainly* as an emendation? It is more justifiable palæographically than some previous conjectures. True, neither Marlowe nor Shakespeare uses the word in any other sense than that of "forcibly, mightily," though King Lear's "I am mainly ignorant" approaches the merely intensive use. But the O.E.D. justifies by early seventeenth-century usage the meaning "lavishly, copiously, abundantly," and some such meaning approximating to the needed sense of "richly" might be possible here. The cares: cares error of IV, i, 35 is surely a misliteration in printing rather than a misreading of handwriting; and is not "bits of needle-

work " an odd explanation of " favours " ? For the purposes of an edition such as this, notes would seem to be needed on " Delian music " (p. 189), " clad " as an infinitive (p. 214), and " tires " in the sense of preys upon (p. 231) ; and the term hexameter for those lines which Professor Tucker Brooke in his earlier study of Marlowe's versification called alexandrines, has for this period an unpleasantly quantitative association. Very few misprints are to be noted ; but in the *Life*, p. 24, fn. 1, the date 1910 should be 1909 ; on p. 74, fn. 4, for 17 read 14 ; and on p. 45 there is a misprint in " pharisaical." On p. 47, the word Catholic has presumably dropped out between ll. 17 and 18 ; and on p. 61 the use of the word " pro-British " has an oddly anachronistic sound. In the Index to the *Life*, a correction is needed *s.n.* Boethius, and *s.n.* Chaucer in the Index to *Dido*, a reference to p. 228 should be added, otherwise an attractive parallel is in danger of being overlooked.

As one would expect, Professor Tucker Brooke's treatment of this first volume gives confidence in the excellence of the series ; the reader remembers with pleasure the comments, such as those on " Marlowe's daydream," and on Marlowe's view of life, that are thrown up out of an unrivalled familiarity with the poet's works, and that lighten the severe tasks of the biographer and editor.

ETHEL SEATON.

The Approach to Shakespeare. By J. W. MACKAIL. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1930. Pp. viii+144. 6s. net.

DR. MACKAIL as second Northcliffe lecturer set himself the task of indicating to his audience at University College, London, an approach to Shakespeare that would satisfy the demands of intelligence, imagination, and common sense. His attempt must command the sympathy of every student of the dramatist ; it is unfortunate, therefore, that he does something to weaken his hold over his well-wishers by ill-considered criticism of the work of at least one scholar who has done so much to make the path on which Dr. Mackail would lead his listeners easier of access.

In his final lecture Dr. Mackail maintains the view that Shakespeare cannot be considered " in the modern sense of the term, an educated man." He supports this extraordinary statement by declaring that " the parallelisms which curious industry has collected,

in countless numbers, with phrases in passages in ancient or foreign authors count for nothing." To make his meaning clear he adds an example :

In Mr. J. S. Smart's *Shakespeare : Truth and Tradition*, Othello's words about the handkerchief, "a sibyl . . . in her prophetic fury sewed the work," are traced to a passage in the *Orlando Furioso* where the embroideries of the magic pavilion brought from the imperial palace at Constantinople for the marriage of Ruggiero and Bradamante—it was made by Cassandra for Hector—are said to have been executed by *una donzella de la terra d'Ilia ch'avea il furor profetico* ; and the inference is drawn that as the words 'prophetic fury' are not in Harington's translation, Shakespeare must have read the *Orlando* from beginning to end (this passage is in the last canto of the poem) in the original Italian. Comment is needless.

It is a pity the question is not so easily disposed of. Dr. Mackail might have paused to consider that Othello's words come from a play which Shakespeare could not—as far as we know—have started on without a reading knowledge of Italian, for the plot of *Othello* comes from Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*. About this time Shakespeare was also busy on *Measure for Measure*, and though he used Whetstone he also used, as scholars have pointed out, Whetstone's sources.

If Shakespeare read Cinthio, why not Ariosto ? He need not have read the whole of the *Orlando Furioso* because he had read in the last canto—Smart made no such claim—but he may well have done so. He may even have read the work to which Ariosto provided a sequel. It is certainly a coincidence that the phrase "prophetic fury" should be associated with embroidery both in Ariosto and Shakespeare. In Ariosto, however, it is Cassandra, not a sibyl, who executes the wonderful work. But in Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*, where there is also mention of a magic embroidery, a passage Ariosto had in mind when composing his last canto, the work is done by a sibyl as in Shakespeare. It would be too much to conclude from this that Shakespeare drew on both passages, but it is certainly a possibility, and no one who has studied the work of Professor Livingstone Lowes on the workings of Coleridge's memory and imagination will dismiss the possibility off-hand. That Shakespeare's memory operated in strange ways on what Dr. Mackail might regard as the reading of an educated man has been demonstrated recently by Mr. Blunden in an interesting paper, "Shakespeare's Significances," where he shows that in composing the scene where Lear runs mad, Shakespeare had recourse to some lines from one of

Horace's Epistles. Any one can quote a Latin author, but to use one's reading in this imaginative and subconscious manner is surely the best proof of that power of assimilation and re-creation which it is the first and last business of education to foster. To trace Shakespeare's reading will demand an industry and reading even more untiring and extensive than that expended by Professor Lowes on Coleridge. He had at least the notebook with which to unlock Coleridge's mind. There is no commonplace book to help with the earlier poet, and the work will have to be done by many scholars. To dismiss without consideration, as Dr. Mackail does, what may prove pointers to this way is to miss the path of intelligence, imagination, and common-sense. Parallels must be weighed in a scholarly manner even if Dr. Mackail has not himself time to give to the task.

The proofs of Shakespeare's classical reading, specially prominent in his earliest plays, Dr. Mackail largely rules out by attributing these works to other hands than Shakespeare's. His anecdote about the charwoman who voiced the sentiments of Seneca would lose its point if we suspected that she had in her earlier years written a Senecan tragedy like *Titus Andronicus*. Shakespearean parallels to Seneca may take on a new importance in any consideration of his reading if we know he was early a borrower from the Latin. But Dr. Mackail tells the now familiar story of the ignorant young man who was asked to rewrite the works of University scholars. He is consistent at least when he concludes by calling him uneducated.

In criticising so freely the canon and the authority of Heminge and Condell, Dr. Mackail raises a number of textual and bibliographical problems which he leaves unexamined. It would be unfair to criticise his work for a lack of precision in matters which he dismisses as beyond his province, though they vitally affect his conclusions. For though the specialist sitting in the gloom of bibliographical and textual studies may often have lost, as Dr. Mackail reminds us, all artistic vision, he who would gaze directly on the bright countenance of such a poet as Shakespeare has often to depend on the historical and other aids devised by his more mechanical fellows. To dispense with them is to be blinded; and Dr. Mackail has too frequently overtaxed his native powers of perception—however fine and sound—by his very human impatience in handling such paraphernalia.

PETER ALEXANDER.

Shakespeare's Plays in the Order of their Writing. By EVA TURNER CLARK. London: Cecil Palmer. 1930. Pp. ix+698. 21s. net.

THOSE who regard Oxford as the author of the plays that pass as Shakespeare's have found a slight objection to their theory in the fact that Oxford died in 1604; for several of the First Folio plays have been by general consent dated after that year. Miss Clark would dispose of this difficulty. From a study of the Records of the Court Revels she finds that scholars have overlooked many early entries referring to these plays. *The History of Sarpedon* mentioned in 1579 is in her opinion a mistranscription of *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *A Morrall of the Marriage of Mynde and Measure*, acted in 1578, an early version of *The Taming of the Shrew*. Miss Clark is equally ingenious in her identifications of historical events and personages with characters and happenings in the plays.

The characters of Othello, Desdemona, and Iago roughly represent (respectively) Alençon; a personification of the city of Antwerp; and a personification of the group of French *mignons* who followed in the train of Alençon.

Miss Clark finds many confirmatory details:

"The mention of the 'Barbary horse' in the play (1, i) refers to Alençon's reception in the Netherlands at the time of his accepting the sovereignty": for Motley describes the Duke's entering Antwerp "on a white Barbary horse, caparisoned with gold."

Miss Clark devotes 700 pages to similar conclusions and arguments.

PETER ALEXANDER.

The Elizabethan Fairies. By MINOR WHITE LATHAM, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1930. Pp. ix+313. 18s. 6d.

THOUGH one cannot agree with Dr. Latham in regarding fairies as supernatural beings, there is no doubt that he has succeeded in making a notable contribution to English fairy-lore. The weakest parts of the book are the chapter on the origin and nature of the fairies and the chapter on Robin Goodfellow. This last is peculiarly disappointing, as the frontispiece depicts Robin Goodfellow in all his glory and is in itself a promise of a detailed and careful study. The

promise is not fulfilled, the treatment suggests haste and loss of interest on the part of the author, and there is not that human touch and spirit of understanding which prevails in the chapters on the fairies. This is the more unfortunate as a complete study of Robin Goodfellow is greatly needed. The fairy portion of the book is extremely good. The author is specially concerned in showing the change which came over the belief in fairies during the Elizabethan period and the part which Shakespeare played in causing that change. He shows from the literature of the period that the butterfly-winged little creatures, who could hide in an acorn cup, were the creation of the poet's mind, totally unlike the fairies of the earlier periods who were of the stature of ordinary men and women. Even at the present day this belief in the larger size of fairies is still held in out-of-the-way parts of the British Isles, where a fairy man is said to be as tall as "a lump of a boy" and a fairy woman to look like "a respectable housekeeper." Dr. Latham has, very properly, gone beyond the poets and learned doctors for information and has included the remarkable evidence given in the witch-trials of the period. The connection between witches and fairies was very close, one of the earliest records being in the trial of Joan of Arc. Part of the evidence against her was that she danced at the Fairy Tree, which (in the words of the Scotch witch-trials) showed that she was in the habit of "hanting and repairing with the farie." In the same connection it is noticeable that the Fairy Tree grew on the land of the Seigneur de Bourlemont (the very name is suggestive) who had, like Bertrand du Guesclin, married a fairy wife. The book is not only worth reading for itself, but is also a mine of reference, with a bibliography extending over more than forty pages. The style is easy and lucid, and is marred only in one place by the terrible vulgarism "equally as." Altogether a book to read and think over.

M. A. MURRAY.

The Disputed Revels Accounts. By A. E. STAMP. H. Milford : Oxford University Press. 1930. Pp. 16, 26 plates. 25s

THE history of these fragments of Revels Accounts dates from 1842, and the debate concerning their authenticity from 1868, a controversy which became acute in 1911, when Mr. Law sought to vindicate them against Mrs. Stopes. The most recent and most

elaborate and ingenious attempt to discredit them is that of Dr. Samuel Tannenbaum in 1928, in his *Shakespeare Forgeries in the Revels Accounts*. Dr. Tannenbaum's industrious scepticism here, as elsewhere, has been a valuable stimulus to scholarship. On October 18, 1929, Mr. Stamp dealt with the problem in a lecture before the Shakespeare Association, which carried conviction to an audience qualified to judge. Further study of the material presented by Mr. Stamp in the present publication serves to confirm this conviction that the question may now be considered to be finally settled, and that the documents may in their entirety be treated as authentic beyond all cavil.

The issue has indeed been complicated and obscured by the mass of inadequately informed argument adduced, mainly by those who have impugned the documents. The danger of arguing on the basis of the study of reproductions alone, when not checked by the originals, for example, is admirably illustrated by Dr. Tannenbaum's insistence on an alleged sign of erasure which, on examination, proves to be a wormhole; and indeed by the whole of his case based upon the peculiarities of ink and paper. It is a most significant fact that as our knowledge of stage history, official history, and the workings of the royal offices concerned has increased, the case for the authenticity of these documents has been strengthened in proportion, and the information they contain has been borne out from independent sources beyond the ken of Peter Cunningham.¹

The result has been to drive the opposing party from pillar to post, to new and finally to extravagant hypotheses to adapt the theory of forgery to the known facts. So Dr. Tannenbaum is reduced to admitting arbitrarily chosen elements of the manuscript material to be genuine, and to postulating incredible and inexplicable freaks in a set of official documents—designed solely, one is tempted to think, in order to permit Cunningham to find blank spaces in which he might forge entries concerning Shakespeare.

Mr. Stamp makes his most telling debating points when he shows how the very arguments used to discredit the entries prove, on more competent and better informed study, to be among the strongest proofs of their authenticity. The "sickle"-shaped mark of a supposed second forger, for instance, is found to be a specific characteristic of Buc's writing (pp. 9-10). To his correction of the

¹ As, for example, in Mr. D. T. B. Wood's "Notes on the Malone Scrap"—*R.E.S.*, January, 1925.

point made by Dr. Tannenbaum concerning Tyllney's signature, I may add that the variations in the two signatures of Tyllney in the 1605 document (Plates VIII and IX) may be paralleled in two signatures which I have found in Chancery and which are undoubtedly authentic.

The evidence adduced by Mr. Stamp upon two main aspects of the question carries with it the weight of the highest authority. He has brought a life-long and admitted competence to bear upon the paleographical and bibliographical matters involved, and upon the little-known details of the complicated system of account-keeping which offers, to one versed in Records, a double check upon such entries. And at every step he has found corroboration, unknown to Cunningham, of their authenticity. The plain fact is, perhaps, apart from the unfortunate history of these documents, that they have seemed to be too good to be true, though obviously they are exactly what a Peter Cunningham would be tempted to abstract, for that very reason. But the conclusion of it all is that any hypothesis of forgery involves us in impossible assumptions and endless inconsistencies, while the acceptance of authenticity offers no difficulties that cannot be removed and is consonant with probability and with every test that can be applied. Indeed, their very difficulties offer further proof of their genuineness.

Mr. Stamp has illustrated his argument with a series of admirable full-size collotype reproductions of the documents, together with other material, including two letters of Buc and enlargements of parts of the documents. To follow Mr. Stamp's argument with the help of this material is to share his certainty that "we are on firm ground in trusting to the authenticity of these documents."

This does not, however, mean that their testimony is implicitly to be relied on in detail in every instance. I offer to the critics of the documents, for example, the problem of the entry concerning *The Royal Slave* in 1636-37, in relation to other evidence available. Was there not here, in drawing up the list of performances, some confusion between "The 12th of January" and Twelfth Night?

CHARLES J. Sisson.

Records of the Stationers' Company, 1576 to 1602, from Register B. Edited by W. W. GREG and ELEANORE BOSWELL. London: The Bibliographical Society. 1930. Pp. lxxxiv+144. Sold to members only.

AFFORDING as they do an insight into the internal workings of the Stationers' Company, the decisions of the Court of Assistants, the governing body of the organisation, are of considerable importance to students of the history of the English book trade. Professor Edward Arber, however, was refused permission to include the section of Register B, which contained the memoranda of these decisions in his *Transcript of the Stationers' Registers*. A small number of them had previously been printed by Herbert in his edition of Ames' *Typographical Antiquities*, but until the appearance of the book under review the greater part of this material was unavailable for study.

In 1927, however, the Court of the Stationers' Company granted permission to the Bibliographical Society to make photostatic copies of the "Decrees and Ordinances" in Register B and of the entire Court Book C as a preliminary step to printing them. The present volume reproduces only the material in the former book, which includes the entries from 1576 to 1602, plus a few notes added by error in the following year. The work is divided into three parts: an introduction by Dr. Greg, the text transcribed by Miss Boswell, with marginal notes by Dr. Greg, and an index compiled by both editors.

Although Dr. Greg's introduction aims only "to give some idea of the nature of the material found in the records," it will probably remain for a considerable time the best available discussion of the organisation of the Stationers' Company during the Elizabethan period. The scope of the introduction may best be indicated, perhaps, by listing some of the topics considered. The personnel and duties of the Court of Assistants—its records, its officers, their functions and powers, the classes of persons whose actions were regulated by the Court, especially master printers, journeymen and apprentices, and finally the varieties of business which came before the Court; the arbitration of disputes between members, administration of the charities and the house-property of the Company, the regulation of the trade, the direction of the Company in its relations with the

government, and the determination of numerous and vexatious questions of copyright—all these and many other topics are briefly, but clearly, discussed by Dr. Greg.

The second part of the work is comprised of the facsimiles and text. Of the facsimiles there are four plates, each reproducing a page or a portion of a page of the register. Plate III, which contains the forged additions made by Collier of entries of the ballads of *The Taming of a Shrew* and *Macdobeth* (pp. lxiii and n. 3, 55), is of especial interest. The transcript is an attempt "to render the original faithfully in all material effects without, however, endeavouring to produce anything like a facsimile." The side-notes deserve attention. Earlier and later references to the matter discussed in an entry either in this volume or in the other sections of the Register (printed by Arber) are indicated, and although the editor does not promise to do so, references to Court Book C are frequently included; the *Short Title Catalogue*-numbers of all books mentioned in the "Decrees and Ordinances" are noted, and when a title is not listed in *S.T.C.*, a reference is made, if it exists, to the entry of registration. When the name of any person connected with the trade who is not listed in the Bibliographical Society's three dictionaries of printers and stationers (edited by E. G. Duff, by R. B. McKerrow and by H. R. Plomer) occurs in the text, an attempt is made to identify him by some reference in the Registers. These notes, needless to say, greatly facilitate the study of the text, and the preparation of them no doubt has cost the editor no little effort.

The index, however, especially interests the reviewer. It is not only an index but a glossary and commentary as well. It is very full, although it does not include the names of modern scholars who are referred to in the introduction. The reviewer has been able to discover but one omission: no reference is made under "Denham, Henry," to the edition of the *Book of Martyrs* begun by him, mentioned on p. 51. The index-references summarise the entries and frequently introduce explanatory material not in the text. In the decree concerning Edward Allde's punishment for printing "a popish Confession," for example, we learn that it was printed "disorderlie without authoritie, lycense and entraunce" (p. 57). Under "Authority" in the index we find, "Authority by official correctors, license and entry the requisites of orderly printing . . . lxix, 57," and similar elucidations are given in the index to "License and Entrance." The index, therefore, serves both as a glossary of

words in their technical sense, symbols and important abbreviations, and as a comment on the meaning of the text. The reader, then, would do well to verify his interpretation of any passage in which there can be any doubt as to the meaning—and the language of the Clerk is by no means always lucid—by consulting the index under the important words of the memorandum to ascertain how the editors paraphrase the entry.

Besides their interest to students of Elizabethan printing, the *Records* throw some light on the social and economic conditions of the time, including such problems as the cost of books, the pay of printers, and the struggles between the freemen of London and the strangers and foreigners.

Several books prominent in the history of English literature were subjects of business decided by the Court, but few new facts concerning them are added to our knowledge. The most important contribution is the additional details to the story of the printing of Sidney's *Arcadia* by Waldegrave in Edinburgh and its piratical sale in the London market (pp. lix, 80, 82, 87, 88). As to some other books, such as Warner's *Albions England*, *Arden of Feversham*, Harington's translation of *Orlando Furioso*, *The History of Dr. Faustus*, Stowe's *Survey* and *Brief Chronicle*, Fox's *Book of Martyrs*, and the *Spanish Tragedy*, we must content ourselves here by mentioning the fact that they appear in the volume.

The names of the editors which appear on the title-page renders it unnecessary to say that the editing has been performed with meticulous care and accuracy. The appearance of the Bibliographical Society's edition of Court Book C, which will carry the record of the work of the Court down to March 1655, will be awaited with interest.

EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY.

English Biography before 1700. By DONALD A. STAUFFER. Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1930. Pp. xviii+392. 18s. net.

DR. DONALD STAUFFER's study is in part an historical survey, but far more a discussion of the nature and development of English biography, "arbitrarily defined as including all lives written by Englishmen" and allowing a liberal interpretation to the term "Englishman." It is followed by a Bibliography consisting of an index of early biographies and a list of the more important works of

reference, and also by a Chronological Table of the more important of the biographies. The last of these, as Dr. Stauffer implies, by itself serves as an indication of the development of English biography in the thousand years which are considered in the body of the work.

In a study of this kind it is almost inevitable, as Dr. Stauffer himself recognises, that there should be some omissions, and one seems to be of importance. In the discussion of the mediæval period the division into royal and ecclesiastical biography is surely too neat, ignoring such works as the rhymed life of William Marshal, who, like his biographer, was as much an Englishman as Anselm, and the *Gesta Herewardi*, which, unhistorical as it may be in part, is no more legendary than some of the saints' lives. There are also later omissions, such as the *Squire Meldrum* of Sir David Lyndsay, that curious survival of an old fashion, which might have been mentioned at least in the Bibliography, and Agnes Beaumont's poignant record of her persecutions. In matters of emphasis Dr. Stauffer might reasonably defend his practice; for his argument Sir James Melville is more important, though Melville the minister is a better writer. But it is unjust to quarrel with an author who has opened so many new sources of pleasure to readers, merely because he has not made specific reference to all the old.

These objections of detail—to which might be added a few slight slips such as the mysterious "prebendary's orders" on p. 92—do not affect the fact that Dr. Stauffer has written an admirable work of critical research in which, in spite of frequent citations from his texts for which we can in reality only be grateful, and occasional pauses to discuss at greater length works of greater significance, he does not lose the thread of his argument—the development of the art of biography, and, with that, the connection of biography with the art of the novel. The rise of the drama—which, as Professor R. W. Chambers has pointed out, has also a close connection with biography—and the rise of the novel have often been considered too narrowly, as if they were entirely unaffected by other contemporary forms of writing. Dr. Stauffer suggests (p. 227) that the publication of some of the seventeenth-century biographies and autobiographies at the time when they were written might have hastened the development of the novel. One might argue, with rather greater plausibility, on the ground that the eighteenth-century novel often pretends to be a genuine biography, autobiography or letter-diary, that the novel only developed because there was not enough genuine material to

satisfy readers. The biographical part of literature pleases most of us, and Dr. Stauffer's book ought to turn many from the fictitious kind to read further in the true histories. EDITH C. BATHO.

The Early Essays and Romances of Sir William Temple, Bt., with The Life and Character of Sir William Temple by his sister Lady Giffard. Edited from the Original MSS. by G. C. MOORE SMITH. Also two unpublished Poems of Sir William TEMPLE, and two poems on "Mother Ludwell's Cave." Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1930. Pp. xxviii+215. 12s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR G. C. MOORE SMITH has added to his numerous services to English Scholarship by publishing an admirable edition of Sir William Temple's early stories and essays together with Lady Giffard's life of her famous brother, and four hitherto unpublished poems, two of which are certainly by Temple, one probably by Swift, and another probably by Lady Giffard. The "romances" are really stories, "novels" in the old sense of *novelle*, freely adapted from the *Histoires Tragiques* of François de Rosset. They remind us of the complaint of Harriet in *The Man of Mode* when Sir Fopling Flutter mentions "intrigues more pleasant, than ever thou read'st in a Novel": "Write 'em, Sir, and oblige us women! our Language wants such little stories." English fiction in the seventeenth century is curiously disappointing, and Temple's stories help us to understand the reason. He tends to depart from the direct narrative of his originals, and to digress into personal meditation and confession. "I forget myself," he admits in one place "and am writing an *essay* where I promised a *story*." We are still in the age of Burton and Browne, and Fielding and even Defoe are far away. The seventeenth-century mind wanted what Temple calls "full scope and ease of rambling," and was more at home in the treatise, the sermon and the essay than in any kind of narrative.

The Early Essays lack the exquisite finish of the best of Temple's later prose, but they are very pleasant informal discourses that read like a transcript of well-bred sensible talk in fine virile seventeenth-century English, completely free from that pedantry which disfigures even Milton's prose. They provide very valuable and interesting illustrations of the rise of the plain and familiar style in the middle of the seventeenth century.

The poems are mere trifles, but they are excellent examples of the pleasing and elegant verses that English ladies and gentlemen could write in days when poetry was regarded rather as the pastime of cultivated minds than as the expression of genius. The heroic couplets *Upon my Lady Giffard's Loory* are especially attractive, and not unworthy of the lighter moments of Dryden himself.

It is hardly necessary to add that Professor Moore Smith's Introduction and commentary are distinguished by the fine scholarship, the good sense and the excellent taste that characterises all his publications. The notes upon Temple's gallicisms in the Romances are of particular interest in connection with the large subject of the influence of translated books on the language in the seventeenth century.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson. By A. BOSKER.

The Hague: J. B. Wolters. 1930. Pp. x+294. F. 5.90.

ALTHOUGH Dr. Bosker calls his study *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson*, it is by implication an essay on the criticism of the whole century. In an introductory section he deals with the main critical tendencies of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; and this section, though necessarily compressed, is a clear and satisfactory summary of the facts. Dr. Bosker's talent, indeed, lies in summary. When he passes on to his own more particular period he is still for the most part summarising, though, of course, in greater detail. After a general section on the criticism of Johnson's day, he collects the critics into three groups—those who believed in the doctrine of reason, those who revolted against this doctrine, and an intermediate group of writers who talked rather vaguely about taste. His plan involves a certain amount of repetition: what has already been stated in the general section tends to reappear when he deals with individual critics. His method, too, is so uniformly one of detailed and patient exposition that the reader may sometimes be at a loss to arrive at general conclusions on the matter. Dr. Bosker provides him with an accurate map of the countryside, but leaves him to trace out its main contours for himself with the aid of his chapter headings. This criticism applies more particularly to those later sections which deal with the views of individual critics. There, too, another trouble arises; for one of Dr. Bosker's critics is so like the next that he is reduced to hitting the same nail

on the head over and over again. There are one or two disappointing omissions. To dismiss Burke in such a work as this with a partial summary (pp. 68-69) and a few scattered references—though Dr. Bosker excuses himself in his preface—is hardly justifiable. The fifth part of the essay on *The Sublime and Beautiful* is particularly relevant to his chapter, "Sublimity and Minuteness" (p. 255), and Burke's awkward groping towards a new and strangely modern critical method might well have received some acknowledgment elsewhere in this book.

Those troubles, however, will not blind Dr. Bosker's readers to the value of what he has done. He has produced what is, in the best sense of the word, a useful book. He is not one of those students of the eighteenth century whose sole interest in the period lies in watching eagerly for any faint glimmerings of a revolt from its standards. Before he touches upon such rebels as Richard Hurd and the Wartons he has already dealt adequately with the main stream of critical theory. His inclusion, too, of such critics as Percival Stockdale and Thomas Twining will probably send many readers to their works for the first time; and there are few students of the century who will not find one or two unfamiliar names in his bibliography. If one longs occasionally to hear Dr. Bosker's own opinion, one must not be ungrateful for the patient and impersonal exposition which he has to offer instead.

J. R. SUTHERLAND.

Les Voyageurs Français en Angleterre de 1815 à 1830, par

ETHEL JONES, M.A., Wales. Docteur de l'Université de Paris. Paris: De Boccard. 1930. Pp. 347.

MISS JONES has chosen an interesting period for her study of the reactions of the French mind to English civilisation. The end of the Napoleonic Wars, which released a swarm of English travellers on to the Continent, also resulted, though less immediately, in a reciprocal flow of French travellers into England, as the intense nationalism of the revolutionary period was leavened by cosmopolitan interests. The soreness of recent defeat, evinced in the comprehensive disapproval of Marshal Pillet's *L'Angleterre Vue à Londres et Dans ses Provinces* (1815) soon disappeared and was replaced by a growing enthusiasm for things English, which helped the visitors to surmount the English climate and the English Sunday—"la meilleure image de l'enfer que j'aie vue sur la terre," Stendhal called

it—and to penetrate the country as far as the Welsh mountains and the industrial districts of the north.

In the first part of her book, Miss Jones has classified these travellers according to their professions and their motives in travelling, and has given a resumé of their works; in the second, she has collected their opinions on the characteristic institutions of English life, social, political, economic, and artistic. The method is cumbrous, but it is on the whole justified by its convenience for reference. Some of the liveliness of the individual observers inevitably evaporates under it; the common French point of view, however, emerges clearly.

The visitors were enthusiasts for the English "home"; they even felt the austere charm of the Protestant religion as it was expressed in family life. A delightful illustration from Eugène Lami's *Voyage en Angleterre* (1829), showing *La Prière du Soir*, testifies to the mingled amusement and respect with which the artist regarded the devout family group. English charitable institutions command admiration and the personal enterprise of Englishmen in social service, while in the country the French notice the advanced state of agriculture, and the good effect of the annual dispersion of the nobility to their estates. The most interesting comments are elicited by the industrial development of the country, so far in advance of that of France. Frenchmen are struck with wonder at the forest of masts on the Thames, but, pushing their enquiries into the manufacturing districts, are appalled at the cost of this wealth in human misery and at the material blindness that has fallen on the country. It is on the intellectual side that they find England disappointing. There is a dead level of opinion, and subservience to convention is destroying that originality of character for which the English have been noted. The great English poets, however, are a new revelation, not alone Shakespeare, who evoked the idolatry of the young, but the Lake poets, with Wordsworth at their head, who appear in the critical accounts of Philarète Chasles and Amédée Pichot.

Miss Jones has made a careful and useful collection of material. She is somewhat timid in the conclusions she draws from it, confining herself to obvious deductions. As she suggests, the opinions of French travellers on England throw a light on the complex character of the French Restoration, but she does not develop this line of enquiry. The book is illustrated by reproductions of eight charming

engravings from the *Souvenirs de Londres* (1826) of Lami, and the *Voyage en Angleterre* (1829) of Lami and Monnier.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS.

Friedrich der Grosse in der Englischen Literatur. Von Dr. HANS MARCUS. Palæstra 173. Mayer and Müller: Leipzig. 1930. Pp. vi+308. 6 plates. Rm.20.

THIS book is rather a study of opinion than a literary study in the stricter sense: it is an impartial survey of the English attitude towards Frederick the Great from the first years of enthusiasm for "the Protestant hero" (excellently summed up in the bombastic *True Character*, translated on pp. 56-57) down to 1900. Of the great writers, Carlyle and Macaulay, representing also the two main divisions of English opinion, naturally receive most attention, and the weight laid upon the historical rather than the literary significance of the matter considered is indicated by the equal treatment of Henty and Thackeray. In spite of the weight of citations which it has to carry, especially in Chapter II, the book remains readable; but it is odd that so carefully-documented a piece of work should refer consistently to J. W. Croker as J. W. Crooker.

E. C. B.

The Letters of John Keats. Edited by MAURICE BUXTON FORMAN. In two volumes. Oxford University Press. 1931. Vol. I, pp. lvi+292; Vol. II, pp. ii+293-607. 36s. net.

THESE beautifully printed volumes represent the definitive edition of Keats's letters. The collection is probably as complete, and the text as accurate, as conscientious care can make them. Mr. Maurice Buxton Forman has based his edition on his father's labours, taking as his foundation Mr. Harry Buxton Forman's edition of the *Letters*, in two volumes, of 1901, and revising his text by reference, where possible, to the originals or to photostats of originals. He has used with amplification his father's annotations, and has availed himself judiciously of the help of other scholars and collectors. He has carried out his own part with modesty, taste and vigilant care, and he deserves all praise and gratitude for the service he has done both to students and amateurs of our literature.

Since his annotations err on the side of over-generous concession

to the ignorant reader—(does any one need to be informed in a footnote that “end my life with a bare bodkin” and “lay the flattering unction” are reminiscent of *Hamlet*?)—two omissions may be noted: Vol. i, p. 160, “I am troubling you with Moods of my own Mind”; the reference needed here is not that given to Keats’s verse-letter to Reynolds, but to Wordsworth’s *Poems in two volumes* 1807, so well loved by Keats, in which one section is headed *Moods of my own Mind*. Vol. ii, p. 476, “Ah hertè mine!” added at the foot of a letter to Fanny Brawne; the reader not already haunted by Chaucer’s *Troilus and Cresseyde* should be referred here to the poignant moments in which these same tender words are wrung from the tormented Troilus, whose exquisite anguish Keats lived through with so profound a sympathy.

A word of protest is needed against the demands of modern scholarship, pushed to-day over the edge of pedantry, which have committed this scrupulous editor to a textual procedure ruinous to the reader’s ease. He sets himself to record Keats’s wayward orthography and punctuation, and to do so he makes use of the footnote and the square bracket. His procedure is not consistent. Sometimes he leaves the mis-spelt word unnoted, sometimes he follows it with an apologetic [*sic*]; sometimes with a square bracket enclosing the right spelling, thus “that [*for than*]”; sometimes he inserts the missing letter in a square bracket within the mis-spelt word, thus “sho[r]t”; sometimes he puts the right form in the text, giving Keats’s erroneous form in a footnote. The irritating effect is cumulative, the square bracket trips the reader up like a croquet-hoop on a lawn made for smooth pacing. The editor’s business is to offer us a readable text. If his original is literature, intended however remotely for publication, the scrupulous editor will make discreet use of textual apparatus to record every variant and every original reading. But the editing of private letters, written in loving or busy haste, never even read through by the writer, much less revised for publication, requires a different procedure. If Keats writes “the” twice there is no need to print “the [the]”; if he is obsessed, as we all are at times, with the p’s in “perhaps,” there is no need to print “perphaps [*sic*].” It is idle to suppose that the individual charm of careless writing and wayward spelling can be reproduced in cold print: the charm irretrievably evaporates. Punctuation is a more teasing problem than spelling: the editor should, I believe, interfere as little as possible. Here is a sentence

in one of Keats's letters punctuated as he intended: "The coachman's face says eat eat, eat." Mr. Buxton Forman must needs operate with his square bracket: "eat[,] eat, eat." Perhaps he would have held his hand had he remembered Pistol's famous: "By this Leeke, I will most horribly revenge I eate and eate I sweare," happily quoted by Mr. Percy Simpson as an instance of Shakespeare's dramatic omission of commas.

But Mr. Forman would fain have us forget the editor and lose ourselves in the letters themselves, whose value he so truly appreciates. Of the letters which he has added to his father's collection two are of paramount interest. On June 25, 1818, as he approached Windermere on his walking tour, Keats began a journal-letter to his brother Tom. A printed version of this letter was recently discovered by Professor Rusk in a Kentucky magazine, *The Western Messenger* of June 1836. The original manuscript, furnished to the editor by George Keats, has been lost. The letter appears as Number 67 in the present collection. The effect of mountain scenery on Keats's imagination is evident in *Hyperion*; his own intellectual analysis of that effect, on the spot, throws light down a number of avenues. Such a passage as the following, on the Ambleside waterfall, illuminates the quality of the imagery in *Hyperion*, but also the maturing character of Keats's visual imagination, and further still his new understanding of the relation he had groped after in *Endymion* between Poetry, Nature and Humanity:

What astonishes me more than anything is the tone, the coloring, the slate, the stone, the moss, the rock-weed; or, if I may so say, the intellect, the countenance of such places. The space, the magnitude of mountains and waterfalls are well imagined before one sees them; but this countenance or intellectual tone must surpass every imagination and defy any remembrance. I shall learn poetry here and shall henceforth write more than ever, for the abstract endeavour of being able to add a mite to that mass of beauty which is harvested from these grand materials, by the finest spirits, and put into etherial existence for the relish of one's fellows. I cannot think with Hazlitt that these scenes make man appear little. I never forgot my stature so completely—I live in the eye; and my imagination, surpassed, is at rest.

Letter 143 is a long-lost letter to Woodhouse, written on September 21, 1819, at a crucial period of poetic production. In it Keats transcribes the *Ode to Autumn*, and also three passages from the *Fall of Hyperion*. Miss Amy Lowell first published this letter in the *Keats Memorial* volume of 1921, but failed to read the true

significance of the *Hyperion* passages. Before this letter came to light the critics had supposed that Keats had given up his first version of *Hyperion* by September 21, 1819 (see letter to Reynolds of this same date): "I have given up *Hyperion*—there are too many Miltonic inversions in it"—and did not begin to recast it into the form of the *Vision or Fall of Hyperion* till the following November, when he had put himself on his guard against Milton. The rediscovered letter to Woodhouse proves that he was at work on the revised version already in September, since all the passages he quotes are from *The Fall*. He tried to give it up, yet returned to it again in the winter. His off-and-on mood is reflected in the hesitancy of the final draft that we know, and is a pathetic symptom of the break-up of his powers.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

A History of Early Nineteenth-Century Drama, 1800 to 1850. 2 vols. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Cambridge University Press. 1930. Vol. 1, pp. x+234+xvii; Vol. 2, pp. vi+235—557. 30s. net.

PROFESSOR NICOLL'S history of the English drama draws steadily nearer to our own time, and in the present volumes deals most effectively with the interesting but somewhat obscure fifty years of transition which lie between Sheridan and Tom Robertson. As before, Professor Nicoll has again handled a vast amount of not-very-tractable material with extraordinary patience and discrimination. He has sorted and classified, and is not afraid to set forth his own eminently reasonable conclusions. None of these are new or startling, but they are all handled with such a pleasant sense of proportion that we read on and absorb his fresh filling-in of detail with as much pleasure as profit.

As in his last volume the historian is still dealing with a period of decline. He seeks, and, we feel is undoubtedly right to seek, his explanation in "the level greyness of early Victorian society. The poor were struggling harshly in a period of industrial change; the rich were duller than they had been in Augustan days. . . . It was only when a wittier spirit arose in more aristocratic circles, and when the industrial chaos began to resolve itself, that a higher drama rose in England towards the end of the century." In consequence, in the sections given to what he calls "the Legitimate Drama" and the "Still-born Drama," Professor Nicoll is mainly anatomising dullness

and depression. When, however, he comes to the "Illegitimate Drama," and escapes from the great patent houses to the "minor" theatres and "the pieces that they play upon the Surrey side" he gives us a stimulating account of one of the most entertaining and also historically significant chapters in the annals of our theatre. It is here, in the world of melodrama and Crummles, that the promise of future vitality and renaissance was to be found. It is here that Professor Nicoll finds the real vitality of the period, and had he allowed himself even more space in which to expand and dwell upon the theatrical delights of these pieces we should have been even more indebted to him.

From a book that contains so much sound comment and such variety of entertaining detail it is impossible, in a short notice, to select more than one or two instances to illustrate its significant judgments and its interesting miscellaneous information. Typical of the former is the passage where Professor Nicoll, taking for illustration *Luke the Labourer or the Lost Son*—one of Buckstone's Adelphi melodramas of 1826—demonstrates very clearly just how valuable for the future and Robertson was the domestic strain in these "illegitimate" pieces. He makes us stop and recognise in the passage he quotes "something that had a direct relationship to life," and also something that "pointed forward towards that type of domestic play which has provided the most characteristic medium of modern theatrical expression." And when we note that in his first forty-seven pages Professor Nicoll not only deals with audiences, theatres, actors, authors, managers and publishers, but contrives also to include a hundred and one little odd facts, such as the earliest notice he has found referring to the use of dated and numbered seat tickets, we realise that he caters comprehensively for our interest in every aspect of that curious institution which was the theatre of the days of Dickens and Thackeray.

M. ST. CLARE BYRNE.

Wilhelm Meister and his English Kinsmen. By SUSANNA HOWE. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Milford. 1930. Pp. x+331. 15s. net.

Miss Howe has attempted to trace "the growth and modification of a set of literary ideas that passed from Germany to England at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries."

These ideas are to be found in Germany in the *Bildungsroman*, the type of novel which relates the development of its hero on his journey through life until he eventually attains to a knowledge of the world and of himself which equips him for the rôle he is to fill. The outstanding example of this *genre* in Germany is Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, and though Miss Howe does not suggest that *Wilhelm Meister* influenced, either directly or indirectly, all the novelists whom she discusses, she draws parallels between their work and Goethe's novel in the endeavour to analyse the varying forms assumed by the theme in English literature. Separate chapters are devoted to Carlyle, Bulwer and Disraeli, and a final chapter discusses specimen novels by a number of living writers. Miss Howe has taken a wide field, and her treatment and conclusions, particularly in the later sections, are somewhat vague and formless, but the first half of her book is a welcome contribution to the study of English and German literary relations during the first half of the nineteenth century.

W. R.

German Lyric Poetry. By NORMAN MACLEOD. The Hogarth Press. 1930. Pp. 158. 3s. 6d. net.

THIS little volume, which forms one of the series of *Hogarth Lectures on Literature*, is an anthology of German lyric poetry from the Minnesang to the present day, interspersed with a running commentary whose purpose is to furnish an outline history of the lyric. The idea was a good one, but unfortunately the anthology is inadequate and the commentary elementary and sketchy. There is little meaning in such jejune statements as "Heine was, to say the least, ill-balanced morally," or "The prose fiction of the Romantics is quite unlike the *Waverley Novels*," and the author's occasionally insufficient scholarship is evidenced, to take one instance, by his remark that "It is possible that folk-poetry was composed at the same time as the Minnesang." We are led to wonder how he could ever have doubted the latter fact. The appeal of the book is intended to be popular, for the poems are in all cases accompanied by translations, but it will give the reader little idea of the wealth and varied beauty of German poetry. We can, however, unreservedly praise Mr. Macleod's own versions of some of the lyrics in Broad Scots.

WILLIAM ROSE.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. LV., October 1931—

Zur altsächsischen und altenglischen (jungeren) *Genesis* (Fr. Klaeber), pp. 393-96.

Ae. *geneord* (W. Krogman), pp. 397-99.

Das Orrmulum und die Frage der intonationsgerechten Orthographie (H. Ch. Matthes), pp. 400-11.

Die mittenglische Hymnodie (Karl Hammerle), pp. 412-30.

The Middle English Canticum de Creatione and the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* (A. C. Dunstan), pp. 431-42.

American Slang *guy* "fellow, chap, person" (W. Fischer), pp. 443-48.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, August 1931—

Letters of Charles Dickens to the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, III (edited by C. C. Osborne), pp. 129-41.

Continued, September, pp. 257-70; October, pp. 385-401.

Memoirs of William Dalgleish, Butler to Sir Walter Scott, III (edited by G. E. Mitton), pp. 213-31.

September—

Dandie Dinmont (G. E. Mitton), pp. 306-16.

Dalgleish's recollections of James Davidson.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 66, August 1931—

Altenglisch *ealuscerwen* und kein Ende (Fr. Klaeber and J. Hoops), pp. 1-5.

The Development of Greek and Mediaeval English Drama: A Comparison (R. C. Bald), pp. 6-15.

Strolling Actors in the Eighteenth Century (F. T. Wood), pp. 16-53.

Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der *Dramatic Idylls* von Robert Browning (M. Alekseev), pp. 54-64.

Ivan Ivanovitch.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XIII., August 1931—

R. Greene's *Alphonsus* (B. A. P. van Dam), pp. 129-42.

October 1—

Beon and *habban* connected with an inflected infinitive (W. van der Gaaf), pp. 176-88.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 121

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 160
(New Series 60), September 1931—

Lesefrüchte aus Übersetzungen von Lord Berners (G. Schleich),
pp. 34-50.

Die Oberbühne bei Marlowe (P. W. Biesterfeldt), pp. 51-60.

Eine angelsächsische Runeninschrift (H. Harder), p. 87.

Inscriptions on rings in the British Museum.

Kipling's Runenschrift (A. Ehrentreich), pp. 89-90.

Just So Stories.

Ae. *feasl*, n. "Nachkommenschaft" und ae. *cnósl* "Nachkommenschaft,
Geschlecht, Familie, Vaterland" (F. Mezger), pp. 91-92.

Zur literarischen Form der Gesta Regum des Wilhelm von Malmes-
bury (M. Weinbaum), p. 92.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXX., July 1931—

Grammatical *Nexus* of the Miltonic Simile (James Whaler), pp. 327-34.

Language Helps for the Elizabethan Tradesman (L. B. Wright),
pp. 335-47.

The Pound of Flesh Story in the North (Margaret Schlauch),
pp. 348-60.

Bunyan's Giant Despair (Harold Golder), pp. 361-78.

Swift's Religion (F. M. Darnall), pp. 379-82.

Basic Principles in Literary History and Literary Criticism (K. F.
Reinhardt), pp. 383-91.

LEUVENSCH E BIJDAGEN, Vol. XXIII., 1931—

Engelsche Oorlogsboeken en Oorlogsschrijvers (R. Kreemers), pp.
1-29.

LIBRARY, Vol. XII., September, 1931—

John Evelyn as a Bibliophil (Geoffrey Keynes), pp. 175-93.

Elizabethan Almanacs and Prognostications (Carroll Camden, Jr.),
pp. 194-207.

The Series of 1583, and the 1588 Predictions.

The Metamorphosis of Ajax and its Sequels (A. E. M. Kirwood),
pp. 208-34.

More Bibliographical Notes on Marston (R. E. Brettell), pp. 235-42.

The three editions of *The Scourge of Villanie*; play quartos and type kept
standing.

"Assembled" Texts (R. C. Bald), pp. 243-48.

Note by W. W. Greg, p. 248.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXVI., October 1931—

Milton's First Marriage, I (B. A. Wright), pp. 383-400.

Proof that it took place in 1642, not 1643.

The Manuscripts of the Poems of Thomas Traherne (Gladys I. Wade), pp. 401-07.

Philip Traherne's corrections.

Arthurian Tombs and Megalithic Monuments (L. Hibbard Loomis), pp. 408-26.

Gogol and English Literature (E. J. Simmons), pp. 445-50.

Notes by George Meredith on Grillparzer's *Ahnfrau* (H. G. Fiedler), pp. 450-53.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIX., August 1931—

The "Godlesse Minde" in Sidney's *Arcadia* (R. B. Levinson), pp. 21-26.

Destouches in England (Ira O. Wade), pp. 27-47.

Comments on English life and the English theatre.

Swift's Yahoos and the Voyagers (R. W. Frantz), pp. 49-57.

The First Edition of the *Dunciad* (W. K. Chandler), pp. 59-72.

Fielding upon Cibber (Houghton W. Taylor), pp. 73-90.

A Contamination in *Lord Randal* (Archer Taylor), pp. 105-07.

The Wills of Two Elizabethan Actors (G. E. Bentley), pp. 110-14.

John Bentley and Thomas Towne.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. XVI., 1931—

The Celebrated Mrs. Centlivre (F. T. Wood), pp. 268-78.

NINETEENTH CENTURY, Vol. CX., September 1931—

Another Unpublished "Imaginary Conversation" by Walter Savage Landor (M. F. Ashley-Montagu), pp. 353-58.

"Emma and her Parents."

— October—

In Praise of Crabbe (S. J. Looker), pp. 489-502.

— November—

Thackeray and the Army (F. E. Whitton), pp. 613-25.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 161, August 1, 1931—

Notes on London Booksellers and Publishers, 1700-1750 (F. T. Wood), pp. 76-82.

Continued August 15, pp. 114-18; August 22, pp. 130-33; August 29, pp. 150-54; September 12, pp. 185-89; September 19, pp. 203-06; September 26, pp. 219-21; October 10, pp. 255-57; October 17, pp. 275-77; October 24, pp. 291-93. Supplementary notes by Ambrose Heal, August 8, pp. 93-99; September 5, pp. 169-73; October 3, pp. 240-44; October 31, pp. 313-16.

An Imitation of Shakespeare (Wm. Jaggard), p. 83.

Preface to a *Discourse concerning Puritans*, 1641, and *Merry Wives of Windsor*, II, i.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 161, August 8—

Note on "The Mutines of Jerusalem" in Shakespeare's *King John* (Mary D. Harris), p. 93.

John Smith's *Destruction of Jerusalem*.

Swift and the Royal Society's Philosophical Transactions (C. M. Webster), pp. 99-100.

Note on *A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*.
Reply by S., September 12, p. 194.

— August 22—

Milton as Translator (Hugh C. H. Candy), pp. 129-30.

Note on the English version of May's *Breviary of the History of the Parliament of England*.

— August 29—

Lamb and the Directors of the East India Company (A. W. Waters), p. 155.

Note on *The Superannuated Man*.

— September 5—

Wilkes and the *North Briton* (Rhodon), pp. 165-66.

Bibliographical. Further notes by J. F. M., September 19, pp. 211-12, and E. G. B., October 10, p. 268.

— September 19—

Poems of the Countess of Winchilsea: Early Title-pages (P. L. C.), p. 208.

— October 3—

William Percy's *Amphrodysial* (M. Hope Dodds), pp. 237-40.

Summary and extracts from Alnwick MS. Continued October 10, pp. 257-61.

— October 10—

Charles Lamb: a Letter and *Mr. H.* (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 261-62.

Letter on Barrow's Sermons in collection of N. P. Willis.

— October 17—

A Note upon Shadwell (Montague Summers), p. 279.

On Shadwell's reference to Salvator Winter in *The Sullen Lovers*.

— October 24—

John Hall, Shakespeare's son-in-law, and Hall of Idlicote (A. Ransford), pp. 293-97.

Biographical and genealogical notes. Continued October 31, pp. 309-13.

— October 31—

Thomas Love Peacock and Weymouth (Wyatt Wingrave), p. 316.

A Note on Sir Thomas Browne (T. O. Mabbott), p. 317.

Photius' record of names said to have been assumed by Achilles.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. X., July 1931—

A Short Study of the Vowels in the Language of the Shuttleworth Accounts (1582-1621) II (H. Whitehall), pp. 268-76.

Masefield's Use of Dipodic Meter (Lilian Woody), pp. 277-93.

Hayward und kein Ende (E. P. Kuhl), pp. 307-08.

Biron and the 116th Sonnet (Thomas B. Stroup), pp. 308-10.

Milton's Demogorgon (E. E. Slaughter), pp. 310-12.

A Possible Etymology for English *Nincompoop* (M. L. Radoff), pp. 312-13.

French *nic à poux*.

The Relation of Tudor Halls to Elizabethan Public Theatres (Fletcher Collins, Jr.), pp. 313-16.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLVI., September 1931—

The Political Import of the Norton Half of Gorboduc (S. A. Small), pp. 641-46.

Faire Em (and Shakespeare's Company?) in Lancashire (Alwin Thaler), pp. 647-58.

The Text of Peele's *David and Bethsabe* (Arthur M. Sampley), pp. 659-71.

Evidence of revision.

Shakespeare and the Fine Arts (Margaret F. Thorpe), pp. 672-93.

Shakespeare's *Richard II*, Hayward's History of Henry IV, and the Essex Conspiracy (Evelyn M. Albright), pp. 694-719.

Prince Hal's "Shew of Zeale" (Herbert Hartman), pp. 720-23.

1 *Henry IV.*, v, iv, 95.

"Honest Iago" (J. W. Draper), pp. 724-37.

A Verse-Sentence Analysis of Shakespeare's Plays (C. A. Langworthy), pp. 738-51.

The Relation of *Epicæne* to Aretino's *Il Marescalco* (O. J. Campbell), pp. 752-62.

Bacon's *New Atlantis* and Campanella's *Civitas Solis*: a Study in Relationships (Eleanor D. Blodgett), pp. 763-80.

The Authorship of *The Revenger's Tragedy* (Wilbur D. Dunkel), pp. 781-85.

Further arguments in favour of Middleton's authorship.

Thomas Randolph, Robert Baron, and *The Drinking Academy* (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 786-801.

Evidence against Baron's authorship.

The Concealed Fansyes: A Play by Lady Jane Cavendish and Lady Elizabeth Brackley (N. C. Starr), pp. 802-38.

Text, and discussion of its authors and its origin.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 125

The Relations of Spenser and Sidney (J. M. Purcell), p. 940.

Note on Professor Harrison's article.

The Allegorical Meaning of Spenser's *Muioptomos* (E. A. Strathmann), pp. 940-45.

Reply to Mr. C. W. Lemmi. Further note by J. M. Purcell, pp. 945-46.

Shelley's *Alastor* Again (Marion C. Wier), pp. 947-50.

Further note by Raymond D. Havens, pp. 450-51.

Dryden and Waller as Members of the Royal Society (Ella T. Riske, L. I. Bredvold and T. B. Stroup), pp. 951-61.

Reply by Claude Lloyd, pp. 961-62.

Concerning Cowley's Prose Style (A. H. Nethercot), pp. 962-65.

Reply by R. F. Jones, pp. 965-67.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAINNE, Vol. VIII., August 1931—

Social Influences once more (J. W. Draper), pp. 489-95.

Importance of the social background in the study of the literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.

— Vol. IX., October—

Milton et l'idée du poète (C. Looten), pp. 1-15.

L'Originalité de Collins (M. Delamare), pp. 16-28.

Note on Shakespeare's Prose (A. Y. Fisher), pp. 41-48.

Swinburne and Walt Whitman (G. Lafourcade), pp. 49-50.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVIII., October 1931 (Royster Memorial Studies)—

Indo-European Bases Derivable from Skt. *Áva* "Down" (F. A. Wood), pp. 1-13.

Whether and If (W. D. Toy), pp. 14-18.

Phonetic Differentiation in English (J. M. Steadman, Jr.), pp. 19-36.

French *gnaf*, Scottish *nyaff* (Urban T. Holmes, Jr.), pp. 37-41.

On Wulfstan's Scandinavia (Kemp Malone), pp. 42-47.

A Note on Saints' Legends (George R. Coffman), pp. 48-54.

The legend of St. Catherine and Hrotswitha's *Sapientia*.

Irish Costume in Lawman (J. S. P. Tatlock), pp. 55-61.

Glimpses of Irish life in the *Brut*.

An Early Mention of a St. Nicholas Play in England (Carleton Brown), pp. 62-69.

The Text of *The Siege of Jerusalem* (J. R. Hulbert), pp. 70-80.

Tales of the Homeward Journey (J. M. Manly), pp. 81-85.

Suggested re-arrangement of *The Canterbury Tales*.

Shakespeare and Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*, an Inquiry into the Criteria for determining Sources (Hardin Craig), pp. 86-98.

Shakespeare's Earliest Plays (R. A. Law), pp. 99-106.

- Cymbeline*, Boccaccio, and the Wager Story in England (W. F. Thrall), pp. 107-19.
 Some Patristic Conventions Common to Shakespeare and Milton (G. C. Taylor), pp. 120-23.
 Lamb on Spenser (Frederick Hard), pp. 124-38.
 The Reading of Renaissance English Women (L. B. Wright), pp. 139-56.
Eastward Hoe and its Satire against the Scots (J. Quincy Adams), pp. 157-69.
 The Date of *Love's Pilgrimage* and its Relation to *The New Inn* (Baldwin Maxwell), pp. 170-77.
 A Note on Ben Jonson's Literary Methods (A. C. Howell), pp. 178-87.
 The First English Translation of the *Prophecies of Merlin* (C. B. Millican), pp. 188-97.
 Three Jacobean Devil Plays (Russell Potter), pp. 198-204.
 A Piracy of Pope's *Iliad* (R. H. Griffith), pp. 205-09.
 T. Johnson's Dutch edition, 1718-1721.
 Shenstone's Heroi-Comical Poem (Richmond P. Bond), pp. 210-17.
The Smuff-box—unpublished manuscript in the British Museum.
 The Hermit and Divine Providence (A. P. Hudson), pp. 218-34.
 Varying versions of medieval story.
 Some Notes on Pierce Egan (George L. Marsh), pp. 252-57.
 Planché's Fairy Extravanzas (Dougald MacMillan), pp. 258-66.
 Literature for an Audience (George F. Reynolds), pp. 278-87.
 A Spanish Play on the Fair Rosamond Legend (S. A. Stoudemire), pp. 325-29.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 6, 1931—

- John Dryden, pp. 601-02.
 Dryden's Abortive Opera (W. J. Lawrence), p. 606.
 Further notes by Montague Summers, August 13, p. 621 by B. M. Wagner, October 1, p. 754.
 Travels in Spain and Portugal (S. George West), p. 609.
 Wordsworth and Camoens.
 Johnson's Schoolmaster (George W. Craig), p. 609.
 Further note on John Hunter.

— August 13—

- "God and Good Men" (C. T. Onions), p. 621.
 Currency of phrase as conventional formula. Further examples quoted by H. E. D. Blakiston, August 20, p. 633; by L. A. Poore and A. J. Barnouw, September 17, p. 706.
 Crashaw and Peterhouse (Austin Warren), p. 621.
 Notes on his associates.

More's *Utopia* (G. G. Coulton), p. 621.

More's seriousness. Note by W. E. Campbell, August 20, p. 633.

Milton and Sannazaro (James Goode), p. 621.

Borrowings in the Latin elegies.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 20—

The Date of Dryden's Birth (Roswell G. Ham), p. 633.

Horoscopes of Dryden and his son in the Bodleian. Reply by D. Macnaughton, September 3, p. 664; further notes by R. G. Ham, September 17, p. 706; by D. Macnaughton, September 24, p. 730.

Munday's *Paradoxes* (R. E. Bennett), p. 633.

Identification of fragment of 1602 edition in the Bodleian.

A Satyr on the Court Ladies (Brice Harris), p. 633.

Copy identified in Harvard Library; evidence against Rochester's authorship.

Swinburne Revisited (W. R. Rutland), p. 633.

Source of lines in *Thalassius*.

August 27—

Whetstone's Death (Mark Eccles), p. 648.

Account of Whetstone's duel in *State Papers Holland*. Note on Massinger supplementing letter of July 16.

The Dream of the Rood (J. L. N. O'Loughlin), p. 648.

Inscription on the Ruthwell Cross: interpretation of further runes.

"Heat an Acre" (H. Cuningham), p. 648.

Suggested emendation of *The Winter's Tale*, 1, ii, 98. Further notes by A. C. Coldicott, September 3, p. 664; by P. B. M. Allan, September 17, p. 706.

September 3—

Hamlet: a Suggestion (P. H. B. Lyon), p. 664.

Note on 11, ii, 316-20. Replies by G. Wilson Knight, September 10, p. 683; A. Quiller-Couch, September 17, p. 706; J. Dover Wilson, September 24, p. 730; P. Alexander, October 1, p. 754; J. D. Wilson, P. H. B. Lyon and G. W. Knight, October 29, p. 842.

September 10—

Birthplace of Richard Rolle (Hope Emily Allen), p. 683.

Rossetti Manuscripts (Simon Nowell Smith), p. 683.

Bibliographical note on *The Ballad of Jan Van Hunks*.

Shelley and Livy (George G. Loane), p. 683.

Note on *Adonais*, xlv.

September 17—

Jane Austen's Letters (R. W. Chapman), p. 705.

Problems still unsolved. Further note, October 29, p. 842.

The Poetry of Henry More (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 706.

Reply by Geoffrey Bullough, September 24, p. 730.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, September 24—

A Satirical Ode by William Mason (Leonard Whibley), p. 727.
Ode to the Legislator Elect of Russia, 1766.

Swinburne and Aurelio Saffi (John Purves), pp. 729-30.
 Saffi's recollections.

Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* (Don Cameron Allen), p. 730.
 Additional notes.

Albany Wallis (Gwenllian E. F. Morgan), p. 730.
 Garrick's friend and executor. Further notes by W. Roberts and R. Dew,
 October 8, p. 778.

October 1—

Literature in Australia, pp. 737-38.

Addison's *The Drummer* (Lee W. Heilman), p. 754.

Milton and Pindar (Lewis R. Farnell), p. 754.

Paradise Regained, IV, 563-65 and *Pythians*, IX, 106.

England's Helicon and Henry Chettle (Hyder E. Rollins), p. 754.
 Identification of "H. C."

Raleigh's Poems : a Correction (H. Harvey Wood), p. 754.
 Misstatement in *Essays and Studies*, xvi.

October 8—

Shakespeare and Shallow (T. W. Baldwin), p. 778.

Arguments against identification of Gardiner as Shallow. Further note
 by J. I. M. Stewart, October 29, p. 842.

An Addition to the Works of Dryden (Roswell G. Ham), p. 778.
 Autograph MS. in the British Museum.

October 15—

Alleged Brontë Manuscript Explained (J. Malham-Dembleby),
 p. 802.

Early Reminiscences.

Fulk Greville's *Workes* (1633) (Geoffrey Bullough), p. 802.

Date of printing and publication.

Shakespeare, Essex and *Richard the Second* (G. B. Harrison), p. 802.

Further evidence connecting Essex and Bolingbroke.

Tennyson and Froude (C. W. Brodribb), p. 802.

Froude's account of the Revenge. Reply by Geoffrey Callender, October
 22, p. 820.

October 29—

Keats's "Diamond Jar" (O. H. T. Dudley), p. 842.

Vindication of Keats's phrase.

Barouche-Landau (Ruth C. Koch and Abby L. Tallmadge), p. 842.

Advertisement and description.

